

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

Program Review Committee

Glossary of Terms:

Academic unit: an academic unit is a department. There are 19 academic units at Westmont.

Program: a program is defined as a major or major/concentration or co-curricular program (e.g., Library, Student Life, Athletics).

Methods of assessment: tools and instruments used to measure student learning.

Direct methods of assessment: include standardized and locally developed tests, student portfolios, embedded assessments, course activities, and oral examinations (competence interviews).

Indirect methods of assessment: include surveys, interviews, focus groups, and reflective essays.

Reliability: Reliable methods are consistent. Students would perform equally well if assessment process was repeated or presented in a unique way. Reliable assessment methods allow assessors to score at an acceptance rate of consistency.

Validity: Valid measures are meaningful. The results of the assessment process inform the assessor by providing data that is useful, and informs the success of student learning. Direct assessment is more valid than indirect.

Note: Fractional scores are acceptable but not required

Criteria	Highly Developed 4 points	Developed 3 points	Emerging 2 points	Initial 1 point
Previous PRC Recommendations	In a designated section, completely addresses all items that were previously identified.	Addresses most items that were previously identified.	Marginally addresses all or only addresses some items that were previously identified.	Ignores the PRC's recommendations or inadequately addresses them.
Quality of Evidence	Faculty collect highly reliable and valid evidence that specifically relates to each outcome.	Faculty collect mostly reliable and valid evidence for each outcome.	Faculty collect evidence, but the reliability or the validity of the evidence collected is questionable.	The evidence is neither valid nor reliable; or there is no evidence.
Measuring Instruments	Instruments or measurement tools (rubrics) identified and description of use is clearly articulated and developed enough to be meaningfully and consistently applied. Instruments are	Instruments or measurement tools identified and description of use is clearly articulated but may need further refinement to be more meaningfully and consistently applied.	Instruments or measurement tools identified, but incomplete, vague, or in early stages of development.	Instruments or measurement tools to assess student learning are not identified.

	attached to the report.			
Methods of Assessment	Both direct and indirect measures are used.	Only direct measures are identified and used.	Only indirect measures are collected.	Neither direct nor indirect measures of student learning are used.
Use of Evidence	There is an explicit, well-reasoned connection between the assessment results and proposed changes.	There is an adequate connection between the assessment results and proposed changes.	The connection between the assessment results and proposed changes are either unclear or not well-reasoned.	The connection between the assessment results and proposed changes are indiscernible.
Completeness	The report is complete. All necessary appendices are attached.	Most required categories in the report are addressed. Some necessary appendices are attached.	Some required categories in the report are addressed.	Most required categories remain unaddressed.
Style	The report is concise, clear and well-written.	Most sections of the report are concise, clear and well-written.	Some sections of the report are too lengthy, or vague, or poorly written.	The report is either too lengthy, or vague, or poorly written.
Reflection on Collaboration and Communication	There is robust evidence of departmental discussions and faculty collaboration on assessment, closing the loop activities, and report preparation.	There is adequate evidence of departmental discussions and faculty collaboration on assessment, closing the loop activities and report preparation.	There is insufficient evidence of departmental discussions or faculty collaboration on assessment activities.	There is no evidence of collaboration and communication.