**Clemson University Rubric for Assessment Review**

**Academic/Administrative Unit: Rubric Completed By: Date Completed:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Characteristics to Consider** | **Sufficient** | **Consider further development** | **Not addressed** | **Suggestions for improvement (see comments on reverse):** |
| **Outcomes**  **(Spring)** | Are the outcomes/objectives limited in number? |  |  |  | 1D |
| Does each of the outcomes/objectives contain only one concept or service for assessment? |  |  |  | 1C, 1E |
| Are the outcomes/objectives measurable? |  |  |  | 1A, 1B, 1D. |
| Do the outcomes/objectives target improvement? |  |  | X |  |
| Are the outcomes/objectives linked to, and do they directly support, the Unit mission statement (and, therefore, are linked to the College Mission and Purpose)? |  |  |  |  |
| Are the outcomes/objectives realistic in terms of the resources and support currently available within the unit? |  |  | X |  |
| **Methods/Means of Assessment and Measures/Levels of Expectation**  **(Spring)** | Are the method(s) for assessing targeted outcomes/objectives clearly stated? |  |  |  | 2B, 2G |
| Does the method provide a measure of the desired outcome/objective with performance standards specified? |  |  |  | 2A, 2C, 2D, 2E, 2F |
| Are the levels of expectations appropriate for the resources and support currently available? |  |  | X |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Assessment Results**  **(Fall)** | Did the method collect sufficient evidence to formulate recommendations? |  |  |  | 3A, 3B, 3C, 3G |
| Do the data analyses explain achievement levels and strengths and weaknesses? |  |  |  | 3D  Strengths should be addressed as well as weaknesses. |
| **Use of Results for Program Improvement**  **(Fall)** | Are the recommendations based on assessment results? |  |  |  | 4B |
| Does the report show where and when changes will be made in response to assessment results? |  |  |  | 4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4F, 4G |
| **Ways in which changes impact budget**  **(Fall)** | Does the report describe how changes based on assessment results could impact the budget? |  |  | X |  |
| **Comments:**  5. Consider use of a curriculum map to illustrate how courses map to program outcomes. | | | | | |

**Frequently Used Comments by Category**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcomes**  1a. Student outcomes should be written in present tense.  1b. Avoid using hard to measure terms (familiarity, understanding, etc.). See Bloom’s Taxonomy in *Assessment Guide*.  1c. Outcomes not written as student learning outcomes.  1d. Too many outcomes to measure in a cycle; simplification would make assessment sustainable over time.  1e. Outcomes contain multiple concepts to be assessed. | **Methods/Means of Assessment and Measures/Levels of Expectation**  2a. Student learning outcomes should include direct measures of student learning.  2b. Measurements not consistent with outcomes.  2c. Method of assessment unclear.  2d. Performance expectations should be clearly stated for each outcome. Where are the majority of students expected to perform based on a rubric, exam, etc.?  2e. What percentage of students are expected to meet a preset score?  2f. Consider reviewing/refining rubric used to clarify the criteria for each level of rubric.  2g. Provide details of survey administration. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Results**  3a. Discussion of results could be more clearly stated.  3b. Course grades are not an acceptable assessment measure (see Suskie, pgs. 10-11).  3c. Consider tables for summarizing assessment data.  3d. No data presented.  3e. Be more specific about sampling procedures, population size, and resulting sample size.  3f. When dealing with a small population, sampling may not be appropriate.  3g. Include the number of students assessed. | **Use of Results for Improvement**  4a. Recommendations vague with no timelines for changes.  4b. A rubric should be considered a student learning tool, thus, we encourage sharing rubrics among faculty and students.  4c. How will the data lead to program improvement?  4d. Discussion of changes does not appear to be based on results  4e. Who reviews these results?  4f. In cases where expectations are met, how will the program move forward to seek improvement; either through setting a higher standard or by moving on to another area to study for improvement.  4g.We recommend greater dissemination of results. |

**Overall Suggestions**

1. Review Suskie, *Assessing Student Learning*.
2. See [Resources](http://www.clemson.edu/assessment/resources/) for suggestions.
3. Consider using a rubric to review student work.
4. If multiple programs are being assessed with the same set of outcomes, how is distinctiveness shown among these programs?
5. Consider use of a curriculum map to illustrate how courses map to program outcomes.
6. GRADUATE PROGRAMS: How is this program progressively more advanced in academic content than the undergraduate program? (SACSCOC CS 3.6)
7. Please notify the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment when final data is submitted.