

Assessment Progress Template (APT), REVISED RUBRIC DRAFT. **Green = minor revision.** **Purple = major revision.**

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
1. Student-centered learning objectives			
A. Clarity and Specificity			
No objectives stated.	Objectives present, but with imprecise verbs (e.g., know, understand), vague description of content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and non-specificity of whom should be assessed (e.g., “students”)	Objectives generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.A. program”)	All objectives stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.A. program”)
B. Orientation			
No objectives stated in student-centered terms.	Some objectives stated in student-centered terms.	Most objectives stated in student-centered terms.	All objectives stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).
2. Course/learning experiences that are mapped to objectives			
No activities/ courses listed.	Activities/courses listed but link to objectives is absent.	Most objectives have classes and/or activities linked to them.	All objectives have classes and/or activities linked to them.
3. Systematic method for evaluating progress on objectives			
A. Relationship between measures and objectives			
Seemingly no relationship between objectives and measures.	At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the measures matches the objectives, but no explanation is provided.	General detail about how objectives relate to measures is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the objectives, or the instrument was selected “because its general description appeared to match our objectives.”	Detail is provided regarding objective-to-measure match. Specific items on the test are linked to objectives. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts (e.g., through a backwards translation).
B. Types of Measures			
No measures indicated	Objectives are not assessed via direct measures (only with indirect measures).	Most objectives assessed with direct measures.	All objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., tests, essays).
C. Specification of desired results for objectives			
No a priori desired results for objectives	Statement of desired result (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year’s data, comparison to faculty standards, performance vs. a criterion), but no specificity (e.g., students will grow; students will perform better than last year)	Desired result specified. (e.g., our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year; our students will score above a faculty-determined standard). “Gathering baseline data” is acceptable for this rating.	Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
D. Data collection & Research design integrity (Systematic method for evaluating progress on objectives cont.)			
No information is provided about data collection process or data not collected.	Limited information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five seniors took the test).	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as a description of the sample, testing protocol, testing conditions, and student motivation. Nevertheless, several methodological flaws are evident such as unrepresentative sampling, inappropriate testing conditions, one rater for ratings, or mismatch with specification of desired results.	The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, two or more trained raters for performance assessment, pre-post design to measure gain, cutoff defended for performance vs. a criterion)
E. Additional validity evidence			
No additional psychometric properties provided.	Reliability estimates (e.g., internal consistency, test-retest, inter-rater) provided for most scores, although reliability tends to be poor (<.60). Or, author states how efforts have been made to improve reliability (e.g., raters were trained on rubric).	Reliability estimates provided for most scores, most scores are marginal or better (>.60).	Reliability estimates provided, most scores are marginal or better (>.60). Plus, other evidence given such as relationship of scores to other variables and how such relationship strengthens or weakens argument for validity of test scores.
4. Results of program assessment			
A. Presentation of results			
No results presented	Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the objectives or the desired results for the objectives.	Results are present, and they directly relate to the objectives and the desired results for objectives but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present.	Results are present, and they directly relate to objectives and the desired results for objectives, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analyses.
B. History of results			
No results presented	Only current year's results provided.	Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year's) provided for some assessments in addition to current year's.	Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year's) provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year's.
C. Interpretation of Results			
No interpretation attempted	Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the objectives or desired results of objectives. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or results.	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology.	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Plus, multiple faculty interpreted results (not just one person). And, interpretation includes how classes/ activities might have affected results.
5. Documents how results are shared with faculty/stakeholders			
No evidence of communication	Information provided to limited number of faculty or communication process unclear.	Information provided to all faculty, mode (e.g. program meetings, e-mails) and details of communication clear.	Information provided to all faculty, mode and details of communication clear. In addition, information shared with others such as advisory committees, other stakeholders, or to conference attendees.

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary	Cusp of National Model for Learning Improvement	National Model for Learning Improvement
6. Documents the use of results for improvement					
A. Program modification and improvement regarding student learning and development					
No mention of any modifications.	Examples of modifications documented but the link between them and the assessment findings is not clear.	Examples of modifications. (or plans to modify) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. However, the modifications lack specificity.	Examples of modifications (or plans to modify) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. These modifications are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation and where in curriculum they will occur.)	Evidence, from direct measures, suggesting learning improvement due to program modifications. This program responded to previous assessment results, made curricular and/or pedagogical modifications, RE-assessed, and found that student learning improved. Lack of clarity regarding the interventions or methodological issues (unrepresentative sampling, concerns regarding student motivation, etc.) leave legitimate questions regarding the improvement interpretation.	Strong evidence, from direct measures, supporting substantive learning improvement due to program modifications. This program responded to previous assessment results, made curricular and/or pedagogical modifications, RE-assessed, and found that student learning improved. The rationale and explanation of the modifications leading to the change are clearly laid out. The methodology is of sufficient strength that most reasonable alternative hypotheses can be ruled out (e.g., sampling concerns, validity issues with instrument or student motivation). In essence, the improvement interpretation can withstand reasonable critique from faculty, curriculum experts, assessment experts, and external stakeholders.
B. Improvement of assessment process					
No mention of how this iteration of assessment is improved from past administrations.	Some critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; Plus evidence of some moderate revision, or general plans for improvement of assessment process.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; both present improvements and intended improvements are provided; for both, specific details are given. Either present improvements or intended improvements must encompass a major revision.	N/A	N/A