University of California, Irvine
Assessment Committee

Guidelines for Reviewing Assessment Reports

Evidence Review Process:

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Type of Evidence Collected	The program has not specified which learning outcome was assessed <u>and/or</u> the program relies heavily on indirect evidence of student learning.	Program has attempted to collect some direct evidence of student learning for one or more of its learning outcomes.	The program identifies when and how each outcome was assessed. Program assesses direct evidence of student learning. Program demonstrates a clear effort at using valid and reliable assessment methods.	The program has a fully articulated, sustainable assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome was assessed. Assessment methods use direct evidence of student learning and are valid and reliable (e.g. have adequate sample size, minimize scoring errors and biases, are tied to a curriculum map, etc.).
Faculty Involvement	Minimal faculty participation and/or it is unclear which faculty were responsible for the implementation of the assessment plan.	Program is inconsistently implementing assessment plans. Lack of widespread faculty involvement and consensus on defining expectations for student learning.	Relevant faculty regularly participate in implementing assessment plans. Efforts are made to achieve consensus on defining expectations for student learning.	Relevant faculty consistently participate in implementing assessment plans. There is formal oversight for the assessment of the program. Program has consensus in expectations of student learning.

Guidelines for Reviewing Assessment Reports

Use of Systematic Criteria for Assessment of Student Work	It is not clear that valid evidence for each outcome was collected and/or individual faculty use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work.	Appropriate evidence is collected and faculty have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each outcome.	Appropriate evidence is collected and faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, systematic qualitative analysis, or other scoring guides, to assess attainment of each outcome.	Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, systematic qualitative analysis, or other scoring guides, have been pilot-tested and refined over time. Faculty have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome. Reviewers of student work are calibrated, and faculty routinely check for and find high reliability (e.g. inter-rater or internal consistency, etc).

Guidelines for Reviewing Assessment Reports

Findings:

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Presentation of Findings	Minimal <u>and/or</u> unclear discussion of assessment findings.	Findings are described, but may lack sufficient detail to lead to decision-making discussions.	Findings are clearly described and sensible to an external audience. Findings are summarized to facilitate areas for further discussion and review.	Findings are clearly described and sensible to an external audience. Findings are presented in ways consistent with the needs, style, and culture of the program. Findings are summarized to facilitate decision-making discussions.
Standard for Performance/Benchmark Established	No standard for performance/benchmark established.	The program has set a benchmark, but has not described the rationale for setting that particular standard.	The program uses some form of comparative data, such as previous findings, external criteria, or aspirational goals.	Clear benchmarks based on previous findings, external criteria, or aspirational goals are established. Faculty take comparative data into account when interpreting results and deciding on changes to improve learning.

Guidelines for Reviewing Assessment Reports

Use of Findings:

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Action Plan for Improving Student Learning	Little or no collective use by faculty of assessment findings. The program has not described any plans and/or undertaken any meaningful actions to improve student learning.	Results for outcomes are collected and discussed by relevant faculty. Action plans are in place but no actions have been taken and/or results have been used only occasionally to improve the program.	Results for outcomes are collected, discussed by relevant faculty and others, and regularly used to improve the program.	Relevant faculty routinely discuss results, plan improvements, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others to improve the program.
Prior Action Plans Evaluated	The program has not addressed previous feedback by the Assessment Committee and/or has not evaluated previous actions taken to improve student learning.	Program addresses feedback from Assessment Committee. Minimal or no evaluation of previous actions taken to improve student learning.	Program addresses feedback from Assessment Committee and monitors prior changes implemented.	The program addresses feedback from Assessment Committee and performs ongoing follow-up studies to confirm that changes have improved student learning.

☐ Student Learning Outcomes Revised

☐ Curriculum Map Revised

*Partially adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges Assessment Rubrics