



Annual Academic Assessment Report Rubric

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

(Revised 12/05/2018)

	Exemplary (3)	Accomplished (2)	Emerging (1)	Beginning (0)
Connection Between SLO and Measure	<p>A clear description of the tool/activity/method is provided.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Tools Used to measure student achievement of the student learning outcome are primarily direct measures</p> <p>AND</p> <p>And explanation is provided about how the assessment tool relates to the outcome being assessed</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Multiple tools are used to gather data for the outcome and/or assessment tool has been validated.</p>	<p>A clear description of the tool/activity/method is provided.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Tools used to measure student achievement of the student learning outcome are primarily direct measures.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>An explanation is provided about how the assessment tool relates to the outcome being assessed.</p>	<p>An incomplete description of the tool/activity/method is provided.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The explanation linking the assessment tool and the student learning outcome being assessed is superficial with no clear connection; while there may be alignment, the explanation is unclear.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Assessment tools are primarily indirect, and include measures such as head counts and course pass rates.</p>	<p>No description of the tool/activity/method provided.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No relationship is apparent between outcome and assessment tools.</p>

Adapted from: University of Kentucky Annual SLO Report Rubric (2016)

	Exemplary (3)	Accomplished (2)	Emerging (1)	Beginning (0)
Data Collection Procedures	<p>Complete explanation of data collection processes and protocols are provided such that the reviewer fully understands the data collection methodology (for example: time/semester and place, sampling process, population descriptions, and/or data review process).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>If a rubric, grading scale, or scoring sheet was used, it is appropriate to the purposes, and a sample document is appended to the report.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Two or more reviewers are used in the data review process, or provide a secondary validation method (e.g., Cronbach's alpha, validity survey, validating focus group).</p>	<p>Complete explanation of data collection processes and protocols are provided such that the external reviewer fully understands the data collection methodology (for example: time/semester and place, sampling process, population description, and/or data review process).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>If a rubric, grading scale, or scoring sheet was used, it is appropriate to the purpose, and a sample document is appended to the report.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about data collection (for example one of the following is missing: time/semester and place, sampling process, population description, and/or data review process).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There appears to be a mismatch between data collected and the student learning outcome(s) being assessed.</p>	<p>No information is provided about data collection process or data was not collected.</p>

	Exemplary (3)	Accomplished (2)	Emerging (1)	Beginning (0)
Summary of Results	<p>Results are present, specific, and disaggregated within the sample population (e.g., performance criteria, demographics, etc.).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Results are represented visually with a premium on clarity, simplicity, and ease of use by the external reviewer (e.g., tables and/or graphs).</p>	<p>Results are present, specific, and disaggregated within the sample population (e.g., performance criteria, demographics, etc.).</p>	<p>Results are present and provided in aggregate format only (e.g., 80% of the students met the target, or average score is 3.5).</p>	<p>No results are present.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Results do not match the assessment tool(s) or methodology (e.g., assessment method is a rubric, however graduation rates or test scores are provided as results).</p>

	Exemplary (3)	Accomplished (2)	Emerging (1)	Beginning (0)
Interpretation and/or Evaluation	<p>Interpretation of results draw connections between the methodologies and results, and seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcome(s).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>A narrative is provided that outlines the discussion of results by pertinent parties involved in data analysis.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The report identifies the person(s) involved in the interpretation of data (Names are not required), and the results were shared with the program stakeholders (e.g., faculty, curriculum committee).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The report discusses benchmarks/targets/goals, whether or not they were met, and why/why not.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>An in depth interpretation is provided (e.g., discussion of limitations, trend data, validation, and reliability tests, results from previous years, or references to targets/goals are provided).</p>	<p>Interpretation of results draw connections between the methodologies and results, and seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcome(s).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>A narrative is provided that outlines the discussion of results by pertinent parties involved in data analysis.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The report identifies the person(s) involved in the interpretation of data (Names are not required), and the results were shared with the program stakeholders (e.g., faculty, curriculum committee).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The report discusses benchmarks/targets/goals, whether or not they were met, and why/why not.</p>	<p>Interpretation of results is ambiguous or superficial, or does not refer back to the outcomes, benchmarks, methodologies, or results. (e.g., We met our benchmarks, or the students were successful)</p>	<p>No interpretation attempted.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The analysis of results repeats what is stated in the Results category of the report. (e.g., 14 students received distinguished ratings, or the average score was 3.5)</p>

	Exemplary (3)	Accomplished (2)	Emerging (1)	Beginning (0)
Student Learning Improvement Actions	<p>Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of student learning.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Description of intended improvement actions are provided.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>There is a clear explanation of the link between the improvement actions and assessment findings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Rationale of intended improvement action is tied to empirical/research based evidence.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The improvement actions are specific, with a brief implementation plan (e.g., approximate dates of and person(s) responsible for implementation, and where in curriculum/activities and department/program they will occur.)</p>	<p>Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of student learning.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Description of intended improvement actions are provided.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>There is a clear explanation of the link between the improvement actions and assessment findings.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The improvements are somewhat specific (e.g., approximate dates, and where in curriculum/activities and department/program they will occur).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If no improvements are planned, then the program has provided a justification or rationale, such as: 1) increase the benchmark, or explain why the benchmark does not need to be increased; 2) state plans to focus on another area of concern for future assessments, 3) and work to monitor and maintain the current level of success for this outcome (i.e., “because” statements).</p>	<p>Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of the assessment process.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Description of intended improvement actions are minimal or nonexistent.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>The explanation of the link between improvement actions and assessment findings is not clear.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>The improvements are too general (e.g., we will add an assignment, or we will do better next year).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No improvements planned and no justification or explanation is given.</p>	<p>No improvements are provided.</p>



Academic Assessment Committee (AAC)

Academic Affairs

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

403 Main St

222 Grambling Hall

Grambling, LA 71245