



Academic Assessment Report Rubric Office of Assessment

	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	Results are present, specific, and disaggregated within the sample population (e.g., performance criteria, demographics, etc.). AND Results are represented visually with a premium on clarity, simplicity, and ease of use by the external reviewer (e.g., tables and/or graphs).	Results are present, specific, and disaggregated within the sample population (e.g., performance criteria, demographics, etc.).	Results are present and provided in aggregate format only (e.g., 80% of the students met the target, or average score is 3.5).	No results are present. OR 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).

	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 lead 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>



UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL
ARKANSAS™

Academic Assessment Committee (AAC)

Academic Affairs

Office of Assessment

201 Donaghey Ave

215 Wingo Hall

Conway, AR 72035