

**IU South Bend Third Year Review Evaluation Rubric**

**Program Name** \_\_\_\_\_ **Year** \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Exceeds Requirements</b> 10 - 12	<b>Meets Requirements</b> 7-9	<b>Partially Meets Requirements</b> 4-6	<b>Does Not Meet Requirements</b> 1-3	<b>Score</b>
<p><b>Learning Outcomes</b> When students successfully complete the program, what should they know? What should they be able to do? What should they value?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All outcomes clearly stated;</li> <li>○ Compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements;</li> <li>○ Measurable;</li> <li>○ An appropriate range of measures;</li> <li>○ Cover key/focused components of learning;</li> <li>○ Reflect multiple levels of learning, primarily higher levels of learning (e.g. Bloom’s Taxonomy: synthesis, application, analysis.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Most are clearly stated;</li> <li>○ Most are compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements</li> <li>○ Most are measurable;</li> <li>○ An adequate range of measures;</li> <li>○ Most cover key/focused components of learning;</li> <li>○ Reflect multiple levels of learning, including higher levels of learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some are clearly stated;</li> <li>○ Some are compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements</li> <li>○ Some are measurable;</li> <li>○ Too many or too few in number</li> <li>○ Most cover key/focused components of learning;</li> <li>○ Some reflect multiple levels of learning, and some may reflect higher levels of learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not clearly stated;</li> <li>○ Not compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements</li> <li>○ Inappropriate number to reflect required student learning</li> <li>○ Not measurable;</li> <li>○ Do not cover key/focused components of learning;</li> <li>○ Generally reflect basic knowledge.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Tools and Processes</b> <b>Direct Measures</b> – directly evaluate student work. Examples of direct measure include exams, papers, projects, and computer programs, interactions with a client or musical performances. <b>Indirect Measures</b> – indirectly evaluate student learning and include asking students and alumni how will they thought they learned, tracking their graduate school or job placement rates, and so on.<sup>1</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Appropriate number of observations;</li> <li>○ All measure mastery of student learning using multiple methods;</li> <li>○ Include a wide range of student work samples;</li> <li>○ Tells you what needs to change and where in the curriculum it must be changed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate number of observations;</li> <li>○ Measure student learning;</li> <li>○ Include student work samples;</li> <li>○ Measures how closely target is achieved and guides curriculum changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some observations;</li> <li>○ Some measure student learning;</li> <li>○ Includes some student work samples;</li> <li>○ Measures how closely target is achieved but may not suggest specific actions for improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Few or no observations;</li> <li>○ No appropriate methods to measure desired student learning;</li> <li>○ No student work samples;</li> <li>○ Does not measure target achievement, does not make necessary curricular changes clear.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Benchmarks/Performance Targets</b> Level of performance students should achieve for selected measures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Well defined and appropriate levels of student learning are identified;</li> <li>○ Measures how closely target is achieved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Defined and adequate levels of student learning are identified;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Loosely defined or insufficient levels of student learning are identified;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No benchmarks or targets for student learning are identified;</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Results and Analysis</b> Information is gathered, summarized and provided to faculty for review, discussion and analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clearly developed and well-conceived analysis;</li> <li>○ Clear findings are reported on all methods</li> <li>○ Faculty and other relevant stakeholders review and discuss all data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Analyses are provided;</li> <li>○ Findings are reported on all methods;</li> <li>○ Faculty review and discuss all data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Analyses are provided;</li> <li>○ Findings are reported on most methods;</li> <li>○ Limited review and discussion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No analysis;</li> <li>○ Insufficient findings or number of methods used;</li> <li>○ Limited or no review and discussion.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Actions</b> How do faculty use assessment information to modify and improve their program?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A thorough plan is developed with broad-based faculty participation to improve curriculum, assessment planning, and/or student learning outcomes;</li> <li>○ Actions provide thorough evidence that findings have influenced curricular and co-curricular decision making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A plan to improve is developed with faculty participation;</li> <li>○ Actions provide evidence that findings have influenced curricular and co-curricular decision making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A plan is with partial faculty participation is developed;</li> <li>○ Unclear connections between findings and curricular and co-curricular decision making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No plan has been developed;</li> <li>○ No evidence-based decision making is discernible.</li> </ul>	

1. Walvoord, Barbara (2004). Assessment Clear and Simple. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.