

BYU-Hawaii Rubric for Academic Assessment Reports

Created 1/27/2017

	Criteria	Initial (1)	Emerging (2)	Developing (3)	Highly Developed (4)
ASSESSMENT METHODS	Assessable Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)	PLO does not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning (vague, immeasurable verb statements like “student understand major theories”). No rubric or measurement developed.	PLO indicates how student can demonstrate learning. Action verb may be general and the PLO may not be observable or measurable. Assessment criteria ¹ have not been identified or are incomplete. Rubric or measurement in early stages of development.	PLO describes how students can demonstrate learning, identifying observable and measurable results. Criteria are articulated in the form of a rubric or other measurement, criteria and standards ¹ may need further development to be more meaningful and consistently applied.	PLO specifically describes how students can demonstrate learning. Rubric or other measurement clearly articulates explicit criteria and standards ¹ for assessing the PLO, identifies the most important aspects of student learning, and includes descriptions of student performance at varying levels.
	Type of Evidence Collected	The program has not specified which learning outcome was assessed and/or the program relies heavily on indirect evidence of student learning.	Program has attempted to collect some direct evidence of student learning for one or more of its learning outcomes.	The program identifies when and how each outcome was assessed. Program assesses direct evidence of student learning. Program demonstrates a clear effort at using valid and reliable assessment methods.	The program has a fully articulated, sustainable assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome was assessed. Assessment methods use direct evidence of student learning and are valid and reliable (e.g. have adequate sample size, minimize scoring errors and biases, are tied to a curriculum map, etc.).
	Valid Evidence	It is not clear that potentially valid evidence is collected for the PLO and/or individual faculty use personalized rather than programmatic criteria and standards ¹ to assess student work.	Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for the PLO but may not include both direct and indirect forms. Evidence needs to be further focused or aligned with PLO or emerging criteria to produce truly meaningful and useful results.	Faculty collect relevant & sufficient evidence for each outcome, including both indirect and direct evidence. Assessment instruments (ex. Rubric) assess the level of student attainment. Evidence is aligned with the PLO and assessment criteria to enable meaningful results and conclusions.	Assessment criteria have been pilot-tested and refined over time, usually shared with students. Direct and indirect evidence are designed to mutually inform conclusions. Feedback has led to refinements in the assessment process.
	Reliable Results	Reviewers of student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way; there are no checks for inter-rater reliability	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way <u>or</u> faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way <u>and</u> faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.	Reviewers are calibrated, and faculty routinely find assessment data to have high inter-rater reliability.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	Findings	Minimal <u>and/or</u> unclear discussion of assessment findings.	Findings are described, but may lack sufficient detail to lead to decision-making	Findings are clearly described and sensible to an external audience. Findings are summarized to facilitate areas for further discussion and review.	Findings are clearly described and sensible to an external audience. Findings are presented in ways consistent with the needs, style, and culture of the program. Findings are summarized to facilitate decision-making discussions.
	Actions	Little or no collective use by faculty of assessment findings. The program has not described any plans <u>and/or</u> undertaken any meaningful actions to improve student learning.	Results for outcomes are collected and discussed by relevant faculty. Action plans are in place but no actions have been taken <u>and/or</u> results have been used <u>only</u> occasionally to improve the program.	Results for outcomes are collected, discussed by relevant faculty and others, and regularly used to improve the program.	Relevant faculty routinely discuss results, plan improvements, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others to improve the program.

¹ Criteria are the specific skills or abilities to be measured. Standards describe the levels of performance for a given criterion (ex. proficient to exemplary).