



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ASSURANCE OF STUDENT LEARNING INITIATIVE RUBRIC**

STUDENT CENTERED LEARNING OUTCOMES				
1	2	3	4	Score
No outcomes stated.	Some (less than ½) outcomes present, but with imprecise verbs (e.g. know, understand). Vague description of content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and non-specificity of who should be assessed (e.g. students).	Most (more than ½) outcomes generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/ or attitudinal domain, and specificity of whom should be assessed (e.g. graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program).	All outcomes with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed	

CURRICULUM MAP				
1	2	3	4	Score
No courses listed.	Some (less than ½) courses listed are not linked to outcomes.	Most (more than ½) courses have outcomes linked to them.	All courses have outcomes linked to them.	

ASSESSMENT MEASURES				
A. Types of Measures				
1	2	3	4	Score
No measures indicated for outcomes.	Outcomes assessed primarily via indirect (e.g. survey) measures and measures are not attached.	Most outcomes assessed primarily via direct measures although some have indirect only.	All outcomes assessed using at least 2 measures of at least 1 is a direct measure (e.g. test, essay). Program attaches the respective measures (i.e. rubric, exam, or exam questions, survey) for measures under review for this cycle.	
B. Rationale for Measure				
1	2	3	4	Score
No information is provided about data collection process or data not collected.	Some (less than ½) information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g. 35 seniors took the test).	Most (more than ½) information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as description of sample, testing protocol, testing conditions, and student motivation. However several flaws such as unrepresentative sampling, inappropriate testing conditions, one rater for ratings, or mismatch with specification of desired results.	All data collection processes are clearly explained and are appropriate to the specification of desired results (including but not limited to: representative sample, adequate motivation, two or more trained raters for performance, pre/post design to measure gain, cutoff defended for performance vs criterion.	
C. Criteria for Success				
1	2	3	4	Score
No criteria specification or justification of desired results provided for outcomes.	Some (less than ½) statement of desired result but no specificity.	Most (more than ½) desired result specified and justified. Gathering baseline data is also acceptable for this rating.	All desired result specified and justified (e.g. Regional accrediting body, disciplinary accrediting body, or previous student work).	



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ASSURANCE OF STUDENT LEARNING INITIATIVE RUBRIC**

RESULTS				
1	2	3	4	Score
No results presented.	Current year's results provided do not include all of the outcomes and measures as indicated in the rotation schedule AND results are superficial (indicates achievement of criterion only) or absent (Data is not explained or presented/attachments are not clear).	Current year's results provided for outcomes as indicated in the rotation schedule for both measures but are not clearly explained.	Current year's results provided for outcomes as indicated in the rotation schedule for both measures. Results clearly explained (i.e. data is presented and/or attachments are offered and clear).	

ACTION PLANS				
1	2	3	4	Score
No mention of how program used prior results to evaluate OR improve student learning.	Action Plan is not present for all outcomes as indicated in the rotation schedule AND actions lack specificity as it relates to documenting strengths of curriculum OR targeted actions to improve the curriculum. (i.e. program action focuses only on discussion).	Action Plan is present for each outcome as indicated in rotation schedule. However actions lack specificity as it relates to documenting strengths of curriculum OR targeted actions to improve the curriculum.	Action is present for each outcome as indicated in rotation schedule. Plan addresses either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The identification of strengths within curriculum or ancillary services (i.e. tutoring/mentoring at university/department level) contribute to outcome achievement <li style="text-align: center;">OR ✓ Targeted action that will be undertaken as a result of the weaknesses identified. Inclusive of a timeline of when (i.e. dates) and where (what courses) in the curriculum the actions will impact. <p>If an identified action is "discussion at department/program level" a finalized targeted action needs to be included immediately post-meeting using the follow up function.</p>	