

<b>IUSB Assessment Third Year Review Evaluation Rubric</b>					
<b>Scores</b>		<b>Educational Goals</b>	<b>Assessment Techniques</b>	<b>Data</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
1	Undeveloped	Absence of clearly defined educational goals	Assessment techniques still being identified; Assessment techniques not currently in use.	No data reported	Little or no analysis of assessment data
2	Developing	Goals are not measurable	Assessment mostly dependent on a single assessment technique or tool; mostly narrative assessment techniques	Only partial data included	Some analysis done, but not shared or discussed with entire program faculty
3	Established	List of clear measurable educational goals for the program	Assessment techniques include a variety of direct and indirect measures of student learning.	All data or representative data included	Assessment data carefully collected, analyzed and shared with all department faculty
4	Exemplary	List of measurable educational goals clearly tied to departmental, general education and campus strategic documents	Assessment techniques include a variety of direct and indirect measures of student learning with a rationale for choice of techniques relative to educational goals.	All data or representative data included. Data submitted in an electronic format. Individuals cannot be identified.	Assessment data is carefully collected, analyzed and discussed by all program faculty. Departmental Assessment Committee active.
	Score				
	Comments				

The rubric was built from an example on the Southeast Missouri State University website: <http://www2.semo.edu/provost/assmt/rubric.htm>.

<b>IUSB Assessment Third Year Review Evaluation Rubric</b>				
<b>Scores</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Constituencies</b>	<b>Record Keeping and Communication</b>	
1	Undeveloped	No changes to the program reported; no rationale for maintaining current program given	Faculty unaware, uninvolved or unsupportive of educational goals and assessment of student learning. Students have no input into or awareness of educational goals.	Assessment data and analysis is not shared beyond the department faculty. Reports to Assessment Committee lacking or very late. No established departmental assessment files. Assessment plan lacking or badly out of date.
2	Developing	Some program changes reported, but not clearly connected to evaluation of assessment data	Faculty knowledgeable about and have input into educational goals and support assessment of student learning. Student input collected and considered informally.	Assessment goals and analysis shared with all faculty, deans, and other parties on request. Assessment plan occasionally evaluated and updated. Annual assessment reports submitted.
3	Established	Program changes made in response to assessment analysis.	Faculty are knowledgeable about the latest theories and techniques for assessing student learning, and actively incorporate that knowledge into course planning and evaluation. Educational goals for courses included on all syllabi. Students have a clear idea of the purpose of assessment and have formal input into the process.	Assessment goals, analysis and actions taken are readily available in an easy to understand format. Assessment annual reports are timely and complete. Assessment plan regularly updated and changes reported to the Assessment Committee.
4	Exemplary	Program changes made, (or status quo confirmed,) clearly and directly supported by assessment analysis. Resources directed to identified weaknesses and accomplishments noted.	Students are not just objects of assessment, but know and contribute to program educational goals. Alumni, employers and community have input into and know the results of assessment activities through a website, focus groups and surveys.	Website showcasing educational goals, assessment data, analysis and program changes. Assessment information is highlighted in departmental newsletters. Assessment Annual reports are timely and complete. Assessment plan updated annually, and submitted with the Third Year Review.
	<b>Score</b>			
	<b>Comments</b>			