<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence or insufficient information was provided</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessment Process | - Program engages in little or no review of student performance on the PLOs.  
- Results of assessment are not discussed or are minimally discussed among faculty and stakeholder engagement is absent or limited. | - Program reviews student performance against outcomes but not on a regular or routinized basis.  
- Results of assessment are discussed, among faculty with minimal engagement of other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field). | - Program has a regular or established process for reviewing student performance against outcomes (i.e., routinized process).  
- Broad-based engagement of faculty and instructional staff.  
- Results of assessment are discussed among faculty and shared on a regular basis with other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field) as appropriate.  
- The program may have an especially distinctive, creative, or innovative way of approaching assessment. |
| Continuous Improvement | - No description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program’s development or performance.  
- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed.  
- Ratings of no evidence or beginning from the last review have not been addressed. | - Some improvements are described and examples are provided without making specific connections to previous action plans or providing clear rationale of any new items.  
- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed.  
- General responses to ratings of no evidence or beginning from the last review are provided. | - The program has implemented actions or next steps from its previous report and/or identified other improvements that were made (i.e., specific improvements are described and examples are provided).  
- Clear rationale is provided where action items identified in the last review were substituted with new items.  
- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report or self-identified improvements were addressed.  
- The program addressed matters related to any ratings of no evidence or beginning received in the last review. |
| Curriculum Map | No curriculum map was provided | - A limited number of PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum OR all of the PLOs are mapped to only one required course or experience.  
- UG Programs Only: Program has not mapped the connections between the six core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum. | - All of the PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum.  
- Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each PLO.  
- Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.  
- UG Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the six core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum in the map though the narrative description may not be complete.  
- Other learning experience (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified.  
- UG Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the six core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum. The program’s narrative includes a discussion of how the program helps cultivate students’ development of the six University Learning Outcomes. |
# Rubric for Evaluating Program Assessment Reports: Template II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Intended Learning Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;* Learner-centered statements of what students will know, do, and become as a result of completing the program [e.g., students will [action verb]]. See Bloom’s Taxonomy.</td>
<td>No evidence presented of intended learning outcomes&lt;br&gt;- PLOs not functional (e.g. incomplete, overly detailed, disorganized, or not measurable).&lt;br&gt;- Describe a process or delivery of education (i.e., what the instructor does for students) rather than intended student learning (i.e., what the intended result is to be).&lt;br&gt;- Do not address the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the cumulative effect of the program.</td>
<td>- Written in a way that they can be measured.&lt;br&gt;- Most outcomes are clearly defined or the meaning is easily discernible.&lt;br&gt;- Most outcomes are written as learner-centered statements.&lt;br&gt;- Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline.&lt;br&gt;- Focus is too narrow to represent the cumulative effect of the program.</td>
<td>- Written in a way that they can be measured&lt;br&gt;- All outcomes are written as learner-centered statements with action verbs&lt;br&gt;- The outcomes are clearly defined.&lt;br&gt;- Encompass program, college, and university mission and goals.&lt;br&gt;- Align with professional standards, as appropriate.&lt;br&gt;- Focus on the cumulative effect of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures (the evidence that is used to evaluate outcomes achievement)</strong></td>
<td>No evidence presented of measures used&lt;br&gt;- Measures apply to too many outcomes at once.&lt;br&gt;- Few or no direct measures used.&lt;br&gt;- Methods are mismatched, inappropriate, or otherwise do not provide evidence linked to the intended learning outcomes.</td>
<td>- At least one measure per outcome.&lt;br&gt;- A variety of direct and indirect measures used to assess outcomes.&lt;br&gt;- The evidence used is mostly linked to the intended outcomes.&lt;br&gt;- Measures section lacks clear description and detail.</td>
<td>- Multiple measures for at least some outcomes.&lt;br&gt;- Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct (i.e., data gathered is primarily focused on student learning activities).&lt;br&gt;- Purposeful and clear how results could be used for program improvement.&lt;br&gt;- Measures section is described in sufficient detail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
<td>No findings or analysis presented&lt;br&gt;- Lack of connection between the outcomes, the data gathered, and results reported.&lt;br&gt;- Degree of proficiency met is unclear from report.</td>
<td>- Some findings are reported that address outcomes and evaluate student achievement of them.&lt;br&gt;- Degree of proficiency met is included.</td>
<td>- Complete, concise and well organized.&lt;br&gt;- Aligned with proficiency targets as appropriate.&lt;br&gt;- Includes interpretation of the degree to which desired outcomes were met.&lt;br&gt;- Compares new findings with past results, where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions Taken or Planned based on Findings</strong>&lt;br&gt;* NOTE: You will refer back to these action items in your next PAR.</td>
<td>No evidence presented of actions taken or planned&lt;br&gt;- Limited evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc.&lt;br&gt;- No actions are documented; or there are too many plans to reasonably manage.</td>
<td>- Some evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc.&lt;br&gt;- At least one concrete action has been documented or planned with relevant details, timelines, etc.</td>
<td>- Actions or plans have been implemented and documented and/or detailed plans for implementation have been provided.&lt;br&gt;- Actions or plans clearly follow from assessment results and state directly which finding(s) motivated the action.&lt;br&gt;- Actions or plans define logical “next steps.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>