Amarillo College PSLO Rubric

Based on James Madison University 2013 Assessment Progress Template Evaluation Rubric

**Target:** 3 – Good for Each Criterion

**Division: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

PHASE 2: ASSESSMENT PLAN EVALUATION

DATE EVALUATED: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Instructions:** Highlight the text yellow that aligns with the level met for each criteria. If anything below a “3” is earned, leave comments related to how the person who submitted the form can improve.

|  |
| --- |
| **III. Measures, Targets, and Methods** |
| **Alignment with PLO Template (i.e. where it should be addressed on template)** | **1 – Beginning**  | **2 – Developing** | **3 – Good** |
| **“Target” column** | **A. Target Identified** |
| No target provided | Desired result stated, but desired result stated is too broad (e.g. students will grow; be better than last year) | Desired result specified with rationale. “Gathering baseline data” can be acceptable for first assessment cycle only. |
| **“Criterion for Success” and “Assessment Measures/Methods” Columns** | **B. Relationship Between Measures and Objectives**  |
| No relationship between measures/outcomes | It is possible that measures and outcomes may align, but the information provided lacks sufficient evidence to determine measures/ outcomes align | Detailed information provided that makes it evident that measures/outcomes align |
| **This information is in the “Outcome” column; the outcome should be measured in multiple ways as evidenced by “Assessment Measures and Methods”****Examples:****Direct Exps.:** Embedded Questions, External/juried evaluation; pre-post test; rubric (analytic or holistic); capstone example competency-specific exam; standardized exam; simulations; portfolios demonstrating competency; etc.**Indirect Exps.:** Awards; Graduation/Retention Comparisons; Focus groups; Surveys; Unregulated homework, general quizzes, exams (i.e. no shared criteria across all classes or subjective materials) | **C. Types of Measures (see Criterion for Success and Assessment Measures/Methods Columns)** |
| No measures provided | Some goals or outcomes are only assessed via indirect measures (e.g. surveys) as opposed to direct measures (e.g. rubric)  | Each outcome has at least one direct measure and at least one other measure used to supplement measure or goal/findings.(Ideally – both direct and indirect measures used)  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments Related to Section III: Measures, Targets, and Methods:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **IV. RESULTS AND IMPROVEMENT** |
| **Alignment with PLO Template (i.e. where it should be addressed on template)** | **1 – Beginning** | **2 – Developing** | **3 – Good** |
| **This information is in the “Results” column** | **A. Presentation of Results** |
| No results presented | Results presented, but it’s unclear how they relate to project or they are difficult to follow | Results are present, clear, and directly relate to intended outcomes |
| **This information is in the “Results” column** | **D. Data Collection Validity**  |
| No information provided | Limited information needed to determine collection validity provided. (e.g. 35 students took the test) | Enough information was provided to understand things such as the collection process, how sampling was conducted, how trainers were trained. |
| **This information is in the “Results” column** | **B. History of Results** |
| No results presented | Past results (e.g. last year’s) provided for at least one outcome | Past results provided for majority of outcomes |
| **This information is in the “Analysis” column** | **C. Analysis of Results** |
| No interpretation attempted | Interpretation attempted, but does not refer to outcome or is not supported by methods/results | Interpretation seems reasonable given the outcome, methodology, and results. |
| **This information is in the “Sharing of Results” column** | **D. Sharing of Results** |
| No evidence of communication | Information provided to limited number of faculty or distribution method unclear | Information provided to all faculty and/or external stakeholders and the distribution method was clear  |
| **This information is in the “Action/Improvement” column** | **E. Improvement of Program** |
| No mention of improvements | Improvement or plans to improve are too broad (e.g. we made or will make changes) or not clearly linked to outcome | Improvements made and directly linked to findings. Very specific implementation dates/information provided. |
| **This information is in the “Action/Improvement” column** | **F. Improvement of Process** |
| No mention of process improvement | Acknowledgment of some flaws, but no plans to improve process | Critical evaluation of past/current assessment. Plans to revise process in some way or at least a critical review or process to absolutely determine no changes needed |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments Related to Section IV: Results and Improvement:** |