

**Rubric for review Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary Reports (May 2023)**

See assessment criteria for Report Sections and descriptions of performance levels that provide context for numerical ratings on spreadsheets.

Please Refer to the [UMD Guide for Learning Outcomes Assessment](#) . *The rating of "0" is indicated when information is not provided for a section of the report.*

<b>Report Sections Assessment criteria</b>	<b>Aspirational performance</b> <i>see UMD Guide for Learning Outcomes Assessment</i>	<b>Exemplary (3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (2)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>
<b>1A: Program-Level Learning Outcomes</b>	The outcomes are clear, specific, measurable, student-focused, and guide the development and assessment of the program. Outcomes describe learning with a level of specificity appropriate for a program. Outcome statements include a condition, action, and criterion for success. Program-level outcomes are general statements reflective of the theories, practices, and methods of the discipline, which are meaningful to an audience of students, faculty, and staff.	The outcomes are clear, specific, measurable, student-focused, and include precise verbs.	The outcomes are clear and measurable.	The outcomes are not clear (e.g., at too high of a conceptual level or with too many concepts per outcome) and/or lack adequate specificity.
<b>1B: Curriculum Map</b>	The alignment between courses and program learning outcomes is presented, including how learning is scaffolded within the program curriculum (e.g., where learning outcomes are introduced, reinforced, and emphasized). The curriculum map may be structured with course sequences, groupings, course levels, or other ways that are meaningful to the program faculty. A description of the collaborative consensus building process used to develop the curriculum map involving faculty and, as appropriate, other stakeholders, is provided.	The alignment between courses and program learning outcomes is presented, including how learning is scaffolded within the program curriculum (e.g., where learning outcomes are introduced, reinforced, and emphasized). Definitions for scaffolding are included. It is evident that learning outcomes are linked to specific courses in the map and all program learning outcomes are presented in the curriculum map. The curriculum map may be structured with course sequences, groupings, course levels, or other ways that are meaningful to the program faculty.	The alignment between courses and program learning outcomes is presented, including how learning is scaffolded within the program curriculum (e.g., where learning outcomes are introduced, reinforced, and emphasized). It is evident that learning outcomes are linked to the courses in the map, but only generally. Several outcomes are either mapped to almost every course or are mapped to only a single course.	The alignment between courses and program learning outcomes is not clear (e.g., every course is mapped to every learning outcome without scaffolding, or not all learning outcomes are listed).
<b>2B: Continuous Improvement-- Improvements Made to Courses, Curricula, and/or Academic Structure in the Past Academic Year</b>	Curricular improvements and relevant assessment results (that may be from a prior year) are summarized. A detailed rationale from those assessment results indicates why the improvements are an appropriate solution to addressing learning challenges.	Prior assessments are summarized and their use is discussed, directly linking them to specific program/curricular improvements. May include instances where a description of the review and discussion of prior assessments are provided	Improvements are expressed in terms of plans for further assessment or in terms of referral (e.g., referral to a committee). Prior assessments were used to guide improvements, the	No improvements have been made or improvements have been made, but in either case use of prior assessments is indicated vaguely or not at all.

Report Sections	Aspirational performance <i>see UMD Guide for Learning Outcomes Assessment</i>	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Based on Prior Assessments		and resulted in a legitimate reason for not implementing changes.	<p>explanation provided is limited with respect to how assessments guide curriculum development or improve student learning.</p> <p><b>Non Applicable (NA)</b> will be used when no change is necessary based on assessment.</p>	
<b>2C: Continuous Improvement--</b> Improvements to Assessment Process during Past Academic Year		Improvements to the assessment process are presented and a rationale for the improvements is provided. The rationale emerges from analysis of prior assessment work or information on assessment best practices, and aligns with the improvements made.	<p>Improvements to the assessment process are presented and a rationale is provided.</p> <p><b>Non Applicable (NA)</b> will be used for programs who have not made changes to the assessment process.</p>	Improvements made to the assessment plan are not explained clearly and/or no rationale for the improvements is provided.
<b>2D: Continuous Improvement--</b> Response to "Unsatisfactory" Scores (1 or 0) during Prior Review Cycle		<p>Improvements were made in the program, curriculum, and/or assessment process to address all of the "unsatisfactory" scores. These improvements are very specific, explained clearly, and directly related to the feedback. Program addresses all unsatisfactory scores.</p> <p><i>If a program did not agree with the feedback (score) provided by the peer review, the program has reached out to their College Coordinator to develop a plan that is reported here.</i></p>	<p>Actions were taken or planned to address all of the "unsatisfactory" scores and a rationale is provided for each action.</p> <p><b>Non Applicable (NA)</b> will be used for programs who have not received "Unsatisfactory" scores during the prior review cycle.</p>	No actions were taken to address "unsatisfactory" scores or actions were taken but either not explained clearly, do not align with the assessment plan, or do not address feedback.
<b>3: Assessment Process Participants</b>	Faculty (with staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals in the field as appropriate) collaborate on a regular basis to engage in LOA activities including curriculum mapping, developing/reviewing learning outcomes, aligning course outcomes with program outcomes, developing assessment	The assessment process engages faculty (with staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals in the field as appropriate for the assessment plan) in the review of student work and collaborative	The assessment process is carried out by a central team/office or a person who consults with faculty, staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals in the field	The assessment process is carried out by one individual and does not include any consultation with others. There is minimal or no discussion

Report Sections	Aspirational performance <i>see UMD Guide for Learning Outcomes Assessment</i>	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
	plans and measures, reviewing student work, interpreting results, and planning actions. Faculty develop course outcomes to align with program outcomes and with the program goals as articulated in the curriculum map. Faculty discuss how their course fits into the curriculum map and collaborate to ensure that there are no learning gaps in the curriculum.	discussions that drive continued improvement of the program according to the program assessment plan. Roles of faculty in this process are explained.	as appropriate for the assessment plan and reports findings to faculty for discussion and review.	of the findings with the faculty.
<b>4A:</b> <b>Assessment Cycle Plan--</b> 4-Year Assessment Plan	The plan clearly illustrates when each outcome will be assessed, with all outcomes being assessed at least once during the four-year cycle. The plan includes context for the plan, addressing how and why the outcomes will be assessed, how data will be collected, whether the assessment will be embedded within a course, and who will review student work. The plan includes a rationale for the data collection design. For example, if the program's intent is to show learning gains then a pre-post design is indicated with the intent given as the rationale.	The plan clearly illustrates when each outcome will be assessed, with all outcomes being assessed at least once during the four-year cycle.	The plan clearly illustrates when each outcome will be assessed. Some outcomes or years are not included in the plan but a meaningful rationale is provided. Incorrect four-year period is presented.	There does not appear to be a cohesive four-year plan and no context is provided for the reviewer. Not all outcomes are assessed in the four-year cycle.
<b>4B:</b> <b>Assessment Cycle Plan--</b> Proposed Measures for Upcoming Academic Year	The proposed measures are consistent with the assessment plan and will provide direct evidence (i.e., measures require students to represent, produce, or demonstrate their learning) of student learning for the specified learning outcome. Assessment measures are accompanied by criteria (e.g., rubrics) that articulate student performance on the learning outcome (e.g., whether student performances meet or do not meet faculty expectations of a learning outcome). The data collection design indicates details of how the assessment plan will be carried out, including criteria related to who will be assessed and procedures for analysis.	The assessment measures provide direct evidence of student learning and are aligned clearly to the specified learning outcome.	The proposed measures are direct indicators of student learning but are not clearly aligned with learning outcomes.	The proposed measures will not reveal actual student learning (e.g., all measures are indirect indicators, or measures do not provide an opportunity to unpack or disaggregate the nature of learning strengths and weaknesses), or the assessment measure is not aligned with the learning outcome.

Report Sections	Aspirational performance <i>see UMD Guide for Learning Outcomes Assessment</i>	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<b>5A:</b> <b>Summary of Assessment Work this Past Year-- Learning Outcome</b>	Outcome is expected to be one of the program outcomes listed in section 1.	See section 1A	See section 1A	See section 1A
<b>5B:</b> <b>Summary of Assessment Work this Past Year-- Measures</b>	The measures are consistent with the assessment plan and provide direct evidence (i.e., measures require students to represent, produce, or demonstrate their learning) of student learning for the specified learning outcome. Assessment measures are accompanied by criteria (e.g., rubrics) that articulate student performance on the learning outcome (e.g., whether student performances meet or do not meet faculty expectations of a learning outcome). The data collection design indicates details of how the assessment plan was carried out, including criteria related to who will be assessed and procedures for analysis. Reviewers reached consensus on the interpretation of the rubric descriptions prior to review of student work (i.e., norming).	Measures provide direct evidence of student learning in areas specified by stated learning outcome. Assessment measures (tools used for analysis of student work such as rubrics) AND prompts used to generate student work (e.g., test questions, paper assignments, pre-test/post-test questions) are supplied in the supporting documents. Rubrics appear to be clear and complete. Assessment activities are clearly and directly connected to the specified learning outcome.	Measures are direct indicators of student learning and are related to learning outcome, but not directly aligned. Rubric or prompt provided but not both.	The measures do not reveal actual student learning (e.g., all measures are indirect indicators, or measures do not provide an opportunity to unpack or disaggregate the nature of learning strengths and weaknesses), or the assessment measure is not aligned with the learning outcome. Assessment activities do not appear to be logical ways to investigate student learning that is described in the stated student learning outcome.
<b>5C:</b> <b>Summary of Assessment Work this Past Year-- Results</b>	Presentation of results aligns with the assessment plan and includes number of students assessed, descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviations, and frequencies), and pertinent demographic information. Evidence is provided showing how the sample is representative of the population about which the program intends to make inferences. Statistical evidence of validity and reliability is presented.	Actual results are presented with a level of detail that allows for an understanding of the assessment. This presentation includes numbers of students assessed, pertinent demographic information (e.g., information showing how the student work that is sampled is representative of the broader population of students in the program), and efforts made to improve reliability (e.g., use of multiple raters, rating training/norming, procedures to standardize assessment administration and scoring,	Actual results are presented with a level of detail that allows for an understanding of the assessment.	Actual results are not presented or insufficient information is provided.

Report Sections	Aspirational performance <i>see UMD Guide for Learning Outcomes Assessment</i>	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
		statistical indexes). The data collection process and analysis methods are evident and allow for interpretation of the data in the context of the learning outcome.		
<b>5D: Summary of Assessment Work this Past Year--</b> Conclusions	Interpretation and conclusions are clearly stated and follow directly from the results presented, with insightful analysis regarding student learning (i.e., conclusions reflect attention to program assessment goals, continuous improvement of the program, the overall curricular structure, the learning outcomes, and the population sampled). Information from faculty and non-faculty stakeholders (e.g., students, alumni) are used to provide wider context for the findings. Interpretations are informed by the program curriculum and provide a working hypothesis to explain the results.	Interpretation and conclusions are clearly stated and follow directly from the results presented, with insightful analysis regarding student learning.	Interpretation and conclusions are clearly stated and provide relevant analysis of the data.	Interpretations and conclusions are not clear or overly general (underlying reasoning is absent).  Interpretations and conclusions are not clear or are overly general (underlying reasoning is absent).
<b>5E: Summary of Assessment Work this Past Year--</b> Actions	Planned actions follow from conclusions and relate to the program goals and curriculum. Specific details are provided, including an implementation plan, timeline, and the changes being made to course learning experiences, curriculum, and/or the assessment process (e.g., changes in the assessment measure and/or revision of course or program learning outcomes or assessment measures).	Discussion of results among assessment process participants is evident and plans for specific improvements in program or curriculum are described and follow directly from the conclusions. If no improvements are adopted, the reasoning for this conclusion is valid and clear.	Plan for action is expressed in terms of plans for further assessment or in terms of referral to a group such as the undergraduate committee or the faculty as a whole.	Discussion of results is indicated only vaguely, with no explanation for how results will be used to guide curriculum development or improve learning, or faculty were not involved in discussions of results.