Rubric for Evaluation of June 2012 Assessment Reports SAC: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 4 | 2 | | | 0 |
| 1. Assessment-driven improvements based on last year’s assessment | * Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students’ attainment of outcomes that result from outcome assessment carried out in 2010-2011. These may include but are not limited to changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc. | Changes are relevant to prior assessment results, described well, and implemented | Changes described but not implemented &/or only changes to assessment are described | | | No suggestion of changes for either outcome attainment or improved assessment offered. |
| **Assessments carried out this year:** For the remaining questions, for each outcome assessed: | | | | | | |
| 2: Design -- (What did you do, and how did you do it?) | * Assessment methods are described and direct (i.e., assesses evidence mastery of outcomes rather than students’ perception of mastery). If indirect assessments are used, rationale is sound * Description identifies student sample assessed (including sample size as a ratio or percentage of targeted student population and process of selection for the student sample) and rationale (why was this group of students or courses chosen) * Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used are included. Where appropriate, benchmarks are noted. * Methods used to analyze results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another), are described | These 4 design elements are included and described well | | Some elements described well and others not at all or all described minimally. | Design elements are unclear to readers. | |
| 3: Results -- (what did you learn about students mastery of the outcome?) | * If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used) data is reported, and related to any benchmarks * Results are broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning? | Both elements are included and results are clear | | One element is clearly described or both are minimally described. | Results are unclear to readers. | |
| 4. Changes to improve teaching and learning | * Changes that that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented toward improving students’ attainment of outcomes are identified. (These may include , but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.) | Specific changes are described clearly and are linked to assessment results. | | Changes are described in general terms. | No changes are described or changes are unrelated to assessment results. | |
| 5. Changes to assessment strategies | * Note changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results are described or it is noted that there are no changes. | Specific changes are described clearly with rationale provided. | | Changes are described in general terms. | No changes are described. | |

**Comments for Evaluation of June** 2012 Assessment Reports  SAC: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| General Comments |  |
| 1. Changes resulting from last year’s assessment? |  |
| 2. DESIGN (What did you do, and how did you do it?) |  |
| 3. RESULTS (what did you learn?) |  |
| 4 . Instructional changes planned based on what was learned? |  |
| 5. Assessment strategy changes planned based on what was learned? |  |
| Other Comments |  |