

Designing Trustworthy Assessment Methods (Rubric VIII-IX)

The goal of the measure is to evaluate whether the curriculum is preparing students to master the program learning outcomes (PLOs) and to identify specific areas for improvement so faculty can make precise, manageable changes within available resources.

Characteristics of Trustworthy Methods	EXAMPLE
<p>Use Representative Samples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on graduating seniors. Avoid assessing electives, internships, or roles (TAs) not completed by all degree majors. <p>Employ Sound Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use multi-rater designs to reduce bias. Develop and norm rubrics collaboratively. Avoid course grades or pass/fail metrics that obscure PLO-specific insights (e.g., bonus points). <p>Demonstrate Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report inter-rater agreement when relevant. Use multiple measures for each PLO (triangulation) when possible. <p>Focus on Actionable Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results indicate clearly what should be improved if the achievement expectations are not met. 	<p>Instrument</p> <p>Students submit a written policy analysis report in XYZ 400 to demonstrate proficiency in PLO 3: Students will apply evidence-based reasoning to evaluate and propose solutions to public sector challenges.</p> <p>Data Collection</p> <p>Faculty collect the student written report in XYZ 400. Artifacts are submitted via the LMS and organized in a shared folder for review. The reports from non-majors are excluded. The student names are redacted to reduce bias.</p> <p>Review Process</p> <p>A panel of five faculty members uses a collaboratively developed and normed rubric to evaluate each artifact. Reviewers meet to calibrate scoring prior to assessment. Two reviewers score each artifact. A third reviewer is used when the difference between the first reviewers is greater than 4.</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Scores are averaged across raters. Incomplete submissions are excluded. Inter-rater agreement was calculated to be 85% for this cycle.</p> <p>Tools & Timeline</p> <p>Rubrics and prompts are attached. Data collection occurs each spring; review and analysis are completed by June.</p> <p>Sustainability</p> <p>All materials and documentation are stored in a shared departmental folder. Faculty are encouraged to use the assessment rubric in their courses and add additional components to meet their grading needs.</p>
Best Practices for Reporting the Method	
<p>Describe the Full Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Who collects the data (e.g., faculty, committee) <input type="checkbox"/> What is collected (e.g., essays, presentations) <input type="checkbox"/> Where/when it's collected (e.g., capstone, final semester) <input type="checkbox"/> How it's reviewed (e.g., normed rubric, faculty panel) <input type="checkbox"/> How it's analyzed (e.g., scoring, exclusions, averaging) <p>Include Tools & Timelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Attach rubrics, prompts, or rating forms <input type="checkbox"/> Share annual collection/review timeline <p>Ensure Continuity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Document clearly for future coordinators <input type="checkbox"/> Use shared folders for sustainability 	

Need Help?

There are no one-solution-fits-all in assessment. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) can support you at every step—ensuring your approach fits your program's goals, resources, and capacity.

[In-depth Assessment Guides](#)

[OIE Website](#)