

Program Learning Outcomes Continuous Improvement Rubric

Reviewers Guide: This rubric is intended to provide useable feedback to colleagues. As such, comments to aid programs in understanding a rating and how to improve their rating are encouraged. In addition, whenever possible strengths within a program's continuous improvement template should be highlighted especially if they are evident of the program moving toward shoring up cited weaknesses. A rubric rule associated with this instrument is that all outcomes must meet all criteria in a rubric level to be scored in any level beyond level 1. For example, if a program lists course grades as the assessment instrument for 3 of its 5 learning outcomes, but has faculty developed rubrics for 2 of its learning outcomes it would be scored at level 1. However, feedback to the program should recognize the use of faculty developed rubrics for 2 outcomes and encourage movement toward assessment of a similar quality for the remaining learning outcomes.

Program:

Date of SLO Committee Review:

Criterion	1-initial	2-emerging	3-developed	4-highly developed
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., limited in scope [course level vs. program level], overly detailed, not directly relevant to the program/profession, and/or disorganized. It may include only institution-wide learning, ignoring relevant program-specific learning.	The list includes program-specific outcomes but does not crosswalk expectations for the institution as a whole. Relevant national disciplinary standards may be ignored.	The list is a well-organized set of program-specific outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and dispositions students learn in the program. It includes a crosswalk to institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication scientific & quantitative reasoning, etc.).	All of 3 AND... Outcomes are appropriate for the level (2 yr. vs. 4 yr.); national disciplinary standards have been considered. Learning Outcomes language is developed with verbs at a level of rigor considerate of the appropriate cognitive level identified by a taxonomy like Blooms or Webbs.

Assessment Task	Opportunities for students to demonstrate all or some program learning outcomes are documented; however, they may be in title only, too numerous to distinguish tight alignment to learning outcome, or lack sufficient description to determine their alignment to the outcome they are intended to measure.	A single activity or distinguishable set of related activities (i.e. scaled assignments or an average of observations) are identified as the assessment task; however, they lack sufficient description to determine their alignment to the outcome they are intended to measure.	A single activity or distinguishable set of related activities (i.e. scaled assignments or an average of observations) are identified as the assessment task AND the description of tasks is sufficient to determine their alignment to the outcome they are intended to measure.	All of 3 AND... there is at least two assessment points, one of which is at the end of program, to assess all program-level learning outcomes.
Assessment Instrument	Course or assignment grades are listed as the assessment instrument. OR Assessment instruments are not identified for all learning outcomes.	A common assessment instrument (rubric, etc.) is in use and has been developed or identified by faculty (i.e. rubric, etc.) for each assessment task.	A common assessment instrument (rubric, etc.) is in use and has been developed or identified by faculty (i.e. rubric, etc.) for each assessment task. AND faculty have identified the desired level of student performance.	All of 3 AND... the program uses external benchmarking data as appropriate or has established inter-rater agreement, test maps, etc. on internal assessments.
Use of Results	Results for each outcome have not been collected.	Results for each outcome are Collected, but are not regularly discussed by the faculty and/or use of results is not evident (i.e. Plans state will continue to think about, continue to gather data, no changes necessary for each learning outcome, etc.) OR intended use of results is vague and/or too many uses are listed to be feasibly implementable.	Results for each outcome are collected by modality, discussed by faculty, analyzed, and used to make specific improvements the program.	Faculty routinely discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others, such as librarians or student affairs professionals, to improve results. Follow-up studies confirm that changes have improved learning.

Sources: <https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/resources/rubricoutcomesplanning.htm>
https://www.wscuc.org/document-list?field_document_type_tid=54

Comments PLOs:

Comments Assessment Task:

Comments Assessment Instrument:

Comments Use of Results:

Overall Comments: