**University of Idaho Assessment Plan Analytic Rubric** Program Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

| PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS | SCORING SCALE |
| --- | --- |
| **EXCEEDS REQUIREMENTS** | **MEETS REQUIREMENTS** | **PARTIALLY MEETS REQUIREMENTS** | **DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS** |
| **Program Learning Outcomes (PLO’s)**When students successfully complete the program, what should they be able to do, know and value as they move to the next stage of their life?* The statement of program learning outcomes (PLO’s) are clear
* PLO’s are comparable to University level student learning outcomes (SLO’s)
* PLO’s cover the scope of University level student learning outcomes
* PLO’s are measureable
* PLO’s reflect multiple levels of learning (see definitions on next page)
 | Nearly all *(at least 80%)* PLO’s are clearly statedNearly all PLO’s flow from the University SLO’sAll five University SLO’s are coveredNearly all PLO’s are measureable using quantitative and/or qualitative measuresNearly all PLO’s suggest the opportunity for multiple levels of learning | Most *(at least 60%)* PLO’s are clearly statedMost PLO’s flow from the University SLO’sFour of the five University SLO’s are coveredMost PLO’s are measureable using quantitative and/or qualitative measuresMost PLO’s suggest the opportunity for multiple levels of learning | Some *(at least 40%)* PLO’s clearly statedSome PLO’s flow from the University SLO’sThree of the five University SLO’s are coveredSome PLO’s are measureable using quantitative and/or qualitative measuresSome PLO’s suggest the opportunity for multiple levels of learning | Few *(less than 40%)* PLO’s clearly statedFew PLO’s flow from the University SLO’sOnly one or two of the five University SLO’s are coveredFew PLO’s are measureable using quantitative and/or qualitative measuresFew PLO’s suggest the opportunity for multiple levels of learning |
| Program Learning Outcomes Comments: |
| **Tools and Processes Used to Assemble Evidence**Direct and indirect evidence of learning was assembled along with evidence collected using face-to-face techniques where students assessed their learning.* Evidence assembled using multiple approaches
* Multiple student activities or work samples are directly assessed
* Student work samples are easily linked to one or more PLO
* Clarity of explanation of how evidence was assembled, from whom it was obtained, and how assessments were conducted
* Evidence is developed throughout a student’s time in a program
* Evidence connects back to mastery of PLO(s) outcome(s)

  | Evidence was assembled using all three types of approaches (direct, indirect, face-to-face with students) At least three student work samples reflecting PLO’s were directly assessed Student work samples reflect a wide variety of directly assessed PLO’s Explaining selection of respondents, assembling evidence and evaluation is clear for nearly all evidenceEvidence is collected at least three points throughout a student’s program and assessed in terms of trend Nearly all evidence collected reflects a student’s mastery of the PLO’s | Evidence was assembled using at least a direct or indirect approach and a face-to-face approach with students At least two student work samples reflecting PLO’s were directly assessed Student work samples reflect a variety of directly assessed PLO’s Explaining selection of respondents, assembling evidence and evaluation is clear for most evidenceEvidence is collected at least two points throughout a student’s program and assessed in terms of trend Most evidence collected reflects a student’s mastery of the PLO’s | Evidence was assembled using only direct and/or indirect approaches and no face-to-face approach with students was usedAt least one student work sample reflecting PLO’s was directly assessed Student work samples generally reflect a single directly assessed PLO Explaining selection of respondents, assembling evidence and evaluation is clear for some evidenceEvidence is collected at one point in a student’s program and the logic for that point in time is explained Some evidence collected reflects a student’s mastery of the PLO’s | It is unclear how evidence was assembled and exactly what approaches were usedNo student work sample was directly assessedStudent work samples do not seem to be directly linked to a PLO(s) Explaining selection of respondents, assembling evidence and evaluation is unclear for most evidenceEvidence is collected at one point in a student’s program and no logic for that point in time is explained Little of the evidence collected reflects a student’s mastery of the PLO’s |
| **Benchmarks/Performance Targets**Targets against which evidence is assessed. They can be as simple as a point on a rubric rating scale, a ratio, a percentage above or below where a rating must fall, or change along a scale. Most important, is to select and define benchmarks useful and relevant for improving a program. Whenever possible select benchmarks that can be used to compare your students’ learning to students external to UI.* Targets are clearly defined and are linkable to one or more PLO’s
* Targets are measurable
 | Nearly all performance targets are clearly defined and related to whichever PLO or PLO’S they are intended to reflectNearly all performance targets are measurable using quantitative and/or qualitative approaches | Most performance targets are clearly defined and related to whichever PLO or PLO’S they are intended to reflectMost performance targets are measurable using quantitative and/or qualitative approaches | Some performance targets are clearly defined and related to whichever PLO or PLO’S they are intended to reflectSome performance targets are measurable using quantitative and/or qualitative approaches | Few performance targets are clearly defined and related to whichever PLO or PLO’S they are intended to reflectFew performance targets are measurable using quantitative and/or qualitative approaches |
| Benchmarks/Performance Targets Comments: |
| **Findings and Analysis**Adequate evidence was assembled and assessed to generate data, which was analyzed, combined and summarized, and used to draw defensible conclusions. Data can be quantitative, qualitative or both.* The evidence assembled is justified (Selection and/or sampling processes, analysis procedures and inferences drawn about the program are reasonable)
* Processed data is presented in a format that links it to benchmarks/targets and the PLO or PLO’s they reflect
* Processed data is presented in a format that links student learning to the spectrum of curricular and co-curricular activities in the curriculum
 | Nearly all evidence that was assembled was analyzedNearly all findings reflect well-conceived analyses, reasonable interpretation of methods used, thoughtful evaluation of limitations, and an exploration of alternative explanations Analyzed data and findings are nearly always connected to a PLO or set of PLO’s they were intended to monitorNearly all processed data is presented in a format that links student learning to the spectrum of curricular and co-curricular activities included in the curriculum  | Most evidence that was assembled was analyzedMost findings reflect well-conceived analyses, reasonable interpretation of methods used, thoughtful evaluation of limitations, and an exploration of alternative explanations Analyzed data and findings are most often connected to a PLO or set of PLO’s they were intended to monitorMost processed data is presented in a format that links student learning to the spectrum of curricular and co-curricular activities included in the curriculum | Some evidence that was assembled was analyzedSome findings reflect well-conceived analyses, reasonable interpretation of methods used, thoughtful evaluation of limitations, and an exploration of alternative explanationsAnalyzed data and findings are sometimes connected to a PLO or set of PLO’s they were intended to monitorSome processed data is presented in a format that links student learning to the spectrum of curricular and co-curricular activities included in the curriculum | Very little of the evidence that was assembled was analyzedFew findings reflect well-conceived analyses, reasonable interpretation of methods used, thoughtful evaluation of limitations, and an exploration of alternative explanationsThere is no identifiable pattern of how analyzed data and findings are connected to a PLO or set of PLO’s they were intended to monitorLittle or none of the processed data is presented in a format that links student learning to the spectrum of curricular and co-curricular activities included in the curriculum |
| Findings and AnalysisComments: |
| **Actions**What actions, based upon the findings of the program assessment process, were initiated to improve the program and how were program faculty and relevant stakeholders involved in making the decision.* Findings were reported to the program faculty and other relevant stakeholders for review and used to draw conclusions about the program, and its achievement of, or need to refine PLO’s or the curriculum
* Proposed actions are traceable to findings and conclusions of the program faculty
* Both curricular and co-curricular actions were discussed and a mix was used as appropriate
 | Program faculty and a wide spectrum of relevant stakeholders interacted and discussed the findings and made recommendations for improvements or no changesNearly all actions or non-actions proposed are traceable to the findings and conclusions drawnProposed actions or non-actions clearly demonstrate that findings have influenced curricular and/or co-curricular decision-making | Program faculty and narrow spectrum of relevant stakeholders interacted and discussed the findings and made recommendations for improvements or no changesMost actions or non-actions proposed are traceable to the findings and conclusions drawnProposed actions or non-actions provide some evidence that findings have influenced curricular and/or co-curricular decision-making | Program faculty interacted and discussed the findings and made recommendations for improvements or no changesSome actions or non-actions proposed are traceable to the findings and conclusions drawnProposed actions or non-actions had unclear connections to findings and conclusions and curricular and/or co-curricular decision-making | It is unclear that program faculty and/or relevant stakeholders interacted to discuss the findings and make recommendations for improvements or no changesFew actions or non-actions proposed are traceable to the findings and conclusions drawnLittle or no evidence-based decision-making concerning findings and conclusions, and curricular and/or co-curricular is discernible |
| Actions Comments: |

**UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO ASSESSMENT PLAN EVALUATION**

**Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Learning Outcomes:**

 **\_\_\_\_\_ Exceeds Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Partially Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Does Not Meet Requirements**

 **Comments:**

**Tools and Processes:**

 **\_\_\_\_\_ Exceeds Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Partially Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Does Not Meet Requirements**

 **Comments:**

**Benchmarks/Performance Targets:**

 **\_\_\_\_\_ Exceeds Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Partially Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Does Not Meet Requirements**

 **Comments:**

**Results and Analysis:**

 **\_\_\_\_\_ Exceeds Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Partially Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Does Not Meet Requirements**

 **Comments:**

**Actions:**

 **\_\_\_\_\_ Exceeds Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Partially Meets Requirements \_\_\_\_\_ Does Not Meet Requirements**

 **Comments:**

**General Comments and Evaluation:**

**University of Idaho Assessment Plan Analytic Rubric for Academic and Certificate Programs**

**Instructions**

As you know a **rubric** is a set of **dimensions** to which performance is compared, rated or assessed. The **scoring scale** (Exceeds Requirements to Does Not Meet Requirements) encourages assessment relative to a set of identified criteria listed in the scoring scale box.

One way to make the application of a rubric more consistent is to provide clear descriptions of both the dimensions upon which programs are assessed as well as for the criteria used to describe the quality of performance expected.

The following explanation is provided to facilitate inter-rater reliability. The intent is to use this rubric as an **analytic rubric** that is to assess levels of performance for each of the specific criterion within a dimension (circle the item that best describes) and then make an overall judgment on the scale by selecting the point or box that best captures the entire dimension (circle the entire box). This often will require a rater to select a single point (box) even though specific criteria for a dimension may be circled in multiple rating boxes.

Please use the comment box for each dimension to provide additional clarification or to make recommendations to the program faculty responsible for the academic program or certificate being rated. Faculty and stakeholders often comment on the usefulness of such comments. So please do not hesitate to provide them.

**Additional Definitions:** Multiple Levels of Learning (Example spectrums)

**High Level** **High Level** **High Level**

Reflect Creating Evaluation

Apply Evaluating Synthesis

Hypothesize Analyzing Analysis

Relate to principle Applying Application

Explain Understanding Comprehension

Argue Remembering knowledge Knowledge

Relate **Low Level** **Low Level**

Comprehend

Name & Describe

**Low Level**

**Direct Measures –** Documenteddirect assessment, often using a rubric, of student work such as a written document, a project, a portfolio, a performance, a dialogue in a foreign language, a video, a podcast, music, a reflective journal entry, a signature assignment, a published article, juried art piece, a task carried out as part of a job evaluated by an individual(s) other than the student who produced the output such as a fellow student, a practicing professional, a faculty member, an employer, etc.

**Indirect Measures –** A self-report questionnaire about the program and a student’s learning experience, indicators such as employment rates, % of students who study abroad, % of students who engage in research, % of students who engaged in a servicing learning opportunity, admission rates into graduate programs, innovative ways of using individual and/or course grade distributions that are clearly linked to PLO’s, etc.

**Face-to-face Measures –** These are modes of direct conversation between a faculty member(s) and a student(s). Group approaches such as a group interview, a focus group, a group discussion, group brainstorming, or other interactive group activities in or outside the classroom are all reasonable. At the faculty/staff member to a single student level such approaches as a formal exit interview, an informal dialogue with notes, or a discussion over lunch with notes are all reasonable.
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