

## Evaluative Rubric for Academic Program Assessment Plan Data Entry

Department: UNM Valencia Campus

An Academic Program is defined as an approved course of study leading to a certificate or degree reflected on a UNM transcript. A graduate-level program of study typically includes a capstone experience (e.g. thesis, dissertation, professional paper or project, comprehensive exam, etc.).

Program Level & Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment Plan Elements	Very Good 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Undeveloped 0	Score
<i>Program Learning Goals</i>	All broad learning goals define what the program strives to accomplish academically, align with college/school/campus and university learning goals, and are sufficiently important to be supported by multiple SLOs.	Broad learning goals are stated in terms of what the program strives to accomplish academically in its graduates; align with college & university goals, and are supported by at least one SLO.	Stated program learning goals may not be stated in terms of what the program strives to do; some or all goals lack SLOs.	Program learning goals may be implied, but are not enumerated.	
<i>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</i>	Multiple SLOs are clearly stated in terms of what a graduate will know, be able to do, or value, are explicitly linked to both program and <a href="#">UNM Learning Goals</a> , and are clearly measurable.	At least two SLOs explicitly linked to broad learning goals and <a href="#">UNM Learning Goals</a> are stated but with some lack of clarity or measurability.	SLOs are stated; their alignment with learning goals is at least suggested; but may not be stated in terms of what a graduate must know, be able to do, or value.	SLOs are absent or if present do not align with a broad learning goals are not stated in terms of what a graduate must know, be able to do, or value.	
<i>Multiple assessment measures</i>	Multiple assessment measures—at least one of which is direct—are identified for each outcome and align well with the SLO.	At least one direct assessment measure is identified for each outcome and aligns well with the SLO.	Assessment measures are identified for some outcomes, a/o one or more measures does not align well with the SLO.	Assessment measures are not identified or inadequately described.	
<i>Target Population</i>	The assessed target population or representative sampling method is clearly identified and valid.			It is unclear which or how many students participated in the assessment.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	For every measure faculty have clearly articulated what constitutes an acceptable level of performance by the student as well as a performance benchmark for the program. The scoring rubric is included along with high and low performance examples of student work.	Faculty have articulated what constitutes acceptable student <b>and</b> program performance but have not included the scoring scale/rubric <b>or</b> high and low performance samples.	Faculty have articulated what constitutes acceptable student <b>or</b> program performance, but not both. “Acceptable” performance is not contextualized by a descriptive scale or rubric.	Standards for student and program performance are not articulated.	

<b><i>Assessment Results</i></b>	Quantitative or Qualitative data is reported for each measure that provides evidence about the relative levels of student mastery of the SLO. Data is reported as percentages of students meeting levels of performance on the basis of which faculty determine the outcome was met, partially met, or not met. Data clearly provides actionable information about student learning of the SLO.	Quantitative or Qualitative data is reported for each measure that provides evidence about the relative levels of student mastery of the SLO. Data is reported as percentages of students meeting levels of performance.	Data is reported in an unclear or confusing format and/or it is unclear how data provides evidence of learning for the SLO. Data may be reported in averages rather than percentages meeting expectations.	No outcomes assessment data is provided.	
<b><i>Analysis of Results Data</i></b>	The process for interpretation, presentation, and discussion of the data is clearly described, including those involved, and analysis of both strengths and weaknesses revealed.	The process is described but is unclear or incomplete in one or more aspects.	Some aspects of the process are noted. e.g. only a strength or weakness may be mentioned.	There is no reporting of analysis.	
<b><i>Recommendations &amp; Actions for implementing improvements based on assessment results</i></b>	Recommendations for implementing improvements are clearly tied to assessment results and improvement actions clearly planned.	The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	There may be a recommendation or an action but not both, or rationale based on assessment results may be lacking.	No response to Recommendations or Actions.	

Action Decided by the College Assessment Review Committee (CARC):

Date of Decision: \_\_\_\_\_

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed (*see first feedback section below*)

Assessment Plan Approved

Feedback on immediate actions that are needed before approval:

Recommendations and feedback for the future (e.g., reporting assessment activities and results):

**Guiding Questions**

- 1. Leads to data of real value?**
  - SLOs high value or convenient?
  - SLOs clearly measurable?
- 2. Make sense?**
  - Doable/Sustainable?
  - Do pieces align?
- 3. Clearly leads to Improvement?**
  - Process leads to improvement conversations?
  - How useful will data be for improving learning?