Program Assessment Report Rubric

Name of Program: _____ **Date of Review** _____

When using this rubric, evaluators will need to refer to the SACs template for the program. Programs may consider providing reports that use data (i.e. budget requests or curricular revision) to provide more evidence for the areas below.

When reviewing the materials, evaluators must look both holistically at the SACs template as well as individually at the SLOs and accompanying data sections. Evaluators should use the feedback section to provide specific information to assist the program with needed revisions.

Helpful Information for Programs to Provide:
- Specific descriptions of the rubric components (e. g., levels, dimensions) – specifically indicate what is an acceptable score/level
- Number of students for which the information pertains (n=?)
- Sub-scores associated with conclusions/changes

	Target	Needs Revision	Unacceptable/Unavailable
Scope of Mission Statement	Mission statement is aligned with multiple university (i.e. mission, Core Commitments), college (i.e. mission, conceptual framework), and accreditation (i.e. professional standards) documents. Links are appropriate and responsive to the needs of the university, college, and students.	A mission statement is provided with little alignment to appropriate university, college, or accreditation documents.	Mission statement is either not available or does not adhere to the overall mission of the university.
	Comments:		
Format of Mission Statement	Statement is concise and addresses a broad description of the purpose of the program.	Minimal changes in the structure of the statement are needed as addressed in the comments.	Statement is not worded in a manner that provides a concise description of the program and/or the program's purpose.
	Comments:		
Assessment of Program (Holistic view)	SLOs are varied enough to provide an overall examination of the program and student learning throughout the program.	The scope of the SLOs provides only a partial examination of the program and student learning throughout the program.	The SLOs are too narrow to provide information about program function and success.
	Comments:		

	Target	Needs Revision	Unacceptable/Unavailable
Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes	SLOs are written in measureable and/or observable language.	Some SLOs need more specific language to indicate expectations in a measureable or observable way.	SLOs are neither measureable nor observable.
	Comments:		
Assessment Method	The assessments for each SLO are precise <u>and</u> appropriate for evaluating the indicated learning outcome.	Some assessments are not adequately precise or are not appropriate for evaluating the indicated learning outcome.	Overall, the assessments are not adequately precise nor are the assessments appropriate for the indicated learning outcomes.
	Comments:		
Level of Performance	A clearly defined level of performance is provided for all assessments. Language used allows a reader unfamiliar with assessment to understand the expectations for acceptable performance.	The language used to indicate acceptable level of performance lacks enough description and clarity to allow a reader unfamiliar with assessment to understand the expectations for acceptable performance.	The level of acceptable performance is not given or is unclear.
	Comments:		
Assessment Results	Student performance data is presented clearly . Trends or variations in performance are summarized. The number or percentage of students meeting expectations is stated.	Student data is presented but may not provide the reader with a complete understanding of student mastery of outcomes or may not reflect obvious trends or variations in the data.	Student data is not summarized with any specificity or does not match stated assessment method.
	Comments:		
Use of Data	Evidence is provided that data were used to inform reflection on the program. Evidence might include influence on curricular decisions, assessment policies, program design, or budget requests. Language must clearly indicate where decisions were influenced by data (even if no change occurred).	Minimal evidence exists to indicate that data collected were used systematically by program faculty to influence evaluation the program. AND/OR Language used does not clearly indicate use of data.	Use of data not evident.
	Comments:		