

Rubric for Reviewing Academic Program Reports (Planning)

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
<p>1. Mission Statement:</p> <p>(1). Describe the purpose and focus of your academic program (e.g., what students with this degree will be prepared to do after graduation with knowledge and skills gained in the program).</p> <p>(2). The physical geographic location of program delivery should be clearly stated for all programs included in the program assessment plan. This refers to the campus and/or the program approved teaching site (e.g., Taos, Galveston, Fort Worth, etc.).</p> <p>(3). If the program is available through distance education technology, this should be noted and the format of delivery should also be clearly stated (e.g., asynchronous, synchronous, or both).</p>	<p>Clearly and concisely articulates what students will be prepared to do after graduation with the knowledge and skills gained from the program.</p> <p>Clearly identifies the location(s) where the program is delivered.</p> <p>Clearly states whether the program is offered through distance education and in what delivery format (e.g., asynchronous, synchronous, or both).</p> <p>Clearly states when students were first enrolled in program.</p>	<p>Generally articulates what students will be prepared to do after graduation with the knowledge and skills gained from the program. Some elements of the mission statement may lack detail or precision.</p> <p>Clearly identifies the location(s) where the program is delivered.</p> <p>Clearly states whether the program is offered through distance education and in what delivery format (e.g., asynchronous, synchronous, or both).</p> <p>Clearly states when students were first enrolled in program.</p>	<p>Partially articulates what students will be prepared to do after graduation with the knowledge and skills gained from the program. Some key elements of the program may not be reflected in the mission statement.</p> <p>May or may not identify the location or modality in which the program is delivered.</p> <p>May or may not state when students first enrolled in the program.</p>	<p>Vague and unclear articulation of what students will be prepared to do after graduation.</p> <p>May or may not identify the location or modality in which the program is delivered.</p> <p>May or may not state when students first enrolled in the program.</p>	<p>No data entered</p>
<p>2. Program Student Learning Outcomes (PLOs):</p> <p>The specified knowledge, skills, abilities, or attitudes that students are expected to attain by the end of a learning experience or program of study.</p>	<p>All outcomes stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill, and specification of who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p> <p>All outcomes stated in student-centered terms</p>	<p>All outcomes are stated with general clarity and specificity including predominantly precise verbs, description of the content/skill, and specification of who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p>	<p>Most outcomes are stated with partial clarity and specificity including some precise verbs, minimal description of the content/skill. Some outcomes specify who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p>	<p>Outcomes are vague, lack clarity and specificity. Verbs are imprecise. There is no description of the content/skill. Outcomes do not specify who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p>	<p>No data entered</p>

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	<p>(i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p> <p>Academic program provides at least 4 PLOs, one must be WIM for undergraduate degree programs.</p> <p>Certificate program provides at least 2 PLOs.</p>	<p>All outcomes stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p> <p>Academic program provides at least 4 PLOs, one must be WIM for undergraduate degree programs.</p> <p>Certificate program provides at least 2 PLOs.</p>	<p>Outcomes are generally not stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p> <p>Academic program provides less than 4 PLOs. WIM is missing for undergraduate degree programs.</p> <p>Certificate program provides less than 2 PLOs.</p>	<p>Outcomes are not stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p> <p>Academic program provides less than 4 PLOs. WIM is missing for undergraduate degree programs.</p> <p>Certificate program provides less than 2 PLOs.</p>	
<p>3. Program Operational Objectives (POs):</p> <p>Specific, measurable statements about improvements a unit would like to make to its programs or services. Each objective should flow directly from a more general goal of the unit.</p>	<p>All objective(s) stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the action/outcome, and specification of what will be assessed (e.g., employment rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>All objective(s) follow logically from the program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>All objectives provide an opportunity to measure program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p>	<p>All objective(s) stated with general clarity and specificity including predominantly precise verbs, description of the action/outcome, and specification of what will be assessed (e.g., employment rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>All objective(s) follow logically from the program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>Most objectives provide an opportunity to measure program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p> <p>Academic program and/or certificate program provides at least 1 PO.</p>	<p>Most objective(s) are stated with partial clarity and specificity including some precise verbs, minimal description of the action/outcome. Some objectives specify what will be assessed (e.g., employment rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>Some objective(s) follow logically from the program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>Objectives generally do not provide an opportunity to measure program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p>	<p>Objective(s) are absent or vague, lacking clarity and specificity. Verbs are imprecise. There is no description of the action/outcome. Objectives do not specify what will be assessed (e.g., employment rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>Objective(s) do not follow logically from the program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>Objectives do not provide an opportunity to measure program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p>	No data entered

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	Academic program and/or certificate program provides at least 1 PO.		Academic program and/or certificate program does not provide any PO.	Academic program and/or certificate program does not provide any PO.	
<p>4. Measures:</p> <p>Describe the measure and discuss why it is the appropriate choice for evaluating your outcome. Measures describe the methods of collecting and evaluating assessment data.</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is clearly explained and logical.</p> <p>All outcomes/objectives assessed using multiple measures, at least one of which is a direct measure (e.g., portfolio, capstone project, enrollment data, career outcome data, etc.).</p> <p>Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.).</p> <p>The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results.</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is generally explained and logical.</p> <p>All outcomes/objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., portfolio, capstone project, enrollment data, career outcome data, etc.).</p> <p>Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.).</p> <p>The data collection process is generally explained and generally appropriate to the specification of desired results.</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is partially explained and in most cases logical.</p> <p>Most outcomes/objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., portfolio, capstone project, enrollment data, career outcome data, etc.).</p> <p>Desired result specified but not justified (e.g., Students will earn at least 70 on their capstone assignment).</p> <p>The data collection process is partially explained and is somewhat appropriate to the specification of desired results</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is unclear and illogical.</p> <p>Outcomes/objectives may not be assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., portfolio, capstone project, enrollment data, career outcome data, etc.).</p> <p>Desired result is neither specified nor justified (e.g., Students will earn at least 70).</p> <p>The data collection process is not explained and/or not appropriate to the specification of desired results.</p>	No data entered

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
<p>5. Targets: A benchmark by which performance will be evaluated (e.g., threshold(s) of acceptability used to determine success).</p>	<p>Targets are clearly defined for all outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>All targets align with the program’s mission and outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>All targets are specific and leave no room for ambiguity.</p>	<p>Targets are clearly defined for most outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>Most targets align with the program’s mission and objectives.</p> <p>Most targets are specific and clear.</p>	<p>Some targets are defined, but they lack clarity and specificity.</p> <p>Targets may not be directly aligned with the program’s mission or objectives.</p> <p>Targets are somewhat vague and may not provide a clear measure of success.</p>	<p>Targets are either not defined at all or are extremely vague and lack specificity.</p> <p>Targets are not aligned with the program’s mission or objectives.</p>	<p>No data entered</p>
<p>6. Results and Findings: (1). Provide results and findings from the information collected through the measures. (2). Interpret results.</p>	<p>Status for all targets is provided.</p> <p>Results are present, and they directly relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives, are clearly presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) provided for all assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results are clearly reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. And, interpretation includes how classes/activities have affected results.</p>	<p>Status for all targets is provided.</p> <p>Results are present, and they generally relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives, are generally presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results are generally reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. And, interpretation includes how classes/activities might have affected results.</p> <p>Some evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.</p>	<p>Status for some targets is provided.</p> <p>Some results are present, and they may or may not relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives, are partially presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) may or may not be provided for assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results may or may not be reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Interpretation may or may not include an explanation of how</p>	<p>No target status is provided.</p> <p>Results are not presented, or results do not relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) are not provided for assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results is missing or does not relate to the given objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Interpretation does not include an explanation of</p>	<p>No data entered</p>

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	Clear evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.		classes/activities affected results. No evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.	how classes/activities affected results. No evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.	
<p>7. Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):</p> <p>Every program is expected to establish and submit a minimum of one action plan for improvement regardless of whether all targets are met.</p>	<p>Action plan(s) clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) were used to develop the plan.</p> <p>Program outlines a well-structured plan for improvement, including specific actions, responsible parties, timelines, and a clear re-assessment schedule.</p> <p>The update clearly articulates how assessment results have directly informed decisions and changes in the curriculum, pedagogy, and other aspects impacting learning.</p>	<p>Action plan(s) for improvement are acknowledged, and there is reasonable detail provided.</p> <p>Some actions taken or planned for improvement are described with a moderate level of detail. Implementation details such as responsible parties and timelines are included.</p> <p>The update explains how assessment results have influenced decisions or changes in the program, though it may not be exhaustive.</p> <p>At least one action plan in place.</p>	<p>Some action plans for improvement are mentioned, but they may lack detail or specificity.</p> <p>Program describes some actions taken or planned for improvement in student learning, but the implementation details are vague or not well-defined. Too general; lacking details (e.g., time frame, responsible party, etc.).</p> <p>Not clearly related to assessment results.</p> <p>At least one action plan in place.</p>	<p>All action plans lack detail.</p> <p>No evidence of an action plan for improvement.</p> <p>Not related to assessment results.</p> <p>At least one action plan in place.</p>	No data entered
<p>8. Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle:</p>	<p>Actions from the previous assessment cycle are thoroughly documented, including their detailed description and implementation status.</p> <p>For actions still in progress, the update provides a</p>	<p>Actions from the previous assessment cycle are acknowledged and described with reasonable detail, including an update on their implementation status.</p> <p>For actions still in progress, there is a clear indication of</p>	<p>Some actions from the previous assessment cycle are briefly mentioned, but the details are lacking. There is limited information regarding their implementation status.</p>	<p>There is no mention of any actions from the previous assessment cycle. The update is entirely lacking in detail regarding actions, their implementation status, or any plans for reassessment.</p>	No data entered

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	<p>comprehensive overview of what transpired during the year, the current status of implementation, and a specific timeframe for re-assessment. The description is clear and well-organized.</p> <p>Completed actions are summarized in-depth, and the update elaborates on their significant impact on student learning. It provides a thorough explanation of the changes observed in program assessment results since the action plan's implementation. The information is comprehensive and supports a strong commitment to improvement and accountability.</p>	<p>what transpired during the year, where the program is in terms of implementation, and a general timeframe for re-assessment.</p> <p>Completed actions are summarized, and their impact on student learning is briefly expanded upon. The update provides some information about changes in program assessment results since the implementation of the action plan.</p>	<p>It is somewhat clear that some actions are still in progress, but the update lacks a comprehensive description of where the program stands in the implementation process or when reassessment is expected.</p> <p>For completed actions, there is a basic summary of their impact on student learning, but it lacks depth and detail. The update provides limited insight into any changes observed in program assessment results since the action plan was implemented.</p>	<p>No information is provided about any action items that are still in progress. There is no insight into the program's current status in implementing these actions, nor when they expect to re-evaluate program-level outcomes.</p> <p>If actions were initiated in the past, there is no reporting on their progress or expected impact. The update doesn't provide any information about changes or outcomes in the program assessment results since the initiation of the action plan.</p>	
Overall Comment:					
Overall Score (out of 32)					