**Assessment Report Review Rubric**

John Bean’s 2015-16 Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Reports

Adapted by David Carrithers and Sophia Sansone 1/3/2017

[Based on Duke University’s BIOTAP (Biology Thesis Assessment Protocol) using a yes/no/somewhat checkoff]

Assessment Report Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | Some-what | No | Comments |
| 1. Is the learning outcome clear and able to be assessed? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the assignment or work being evaluated a clear reflection of the learning outcome being assessed? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the department used a rubric or defined standards for minimally acceptable, acceptable, and aspirational mastery of this learning outcome? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there evidence in the report that broad and meaningful department discussions about the meaning of and responses to the assessment results took place? |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | Unclear  or vague | No | Comments |
| 1. Did the program establish a goal/threshold for their students’ performance? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Did the program meet its threshold in terms of acceptable student performance? |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If needed, are “closing the loop” actions clearly planned and specified? |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Yes | No | Comments |
| 1. Is there evidence that this report is of value in moving the program forward in terms of improving its teaching (faculty) and learning (students)? | |  |  |  |
| 1. Does this report meet the University Assessment Committee standards for demonstrating student achievement of the learning outcome? Meaning, did 75% of the students meet the goal the faculty set for their performance? | |  |  |  |
| 1. Other comments or feedback? |  | | | |