<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessment Process | No evidence or insufficient information was provided | - Program engages in little or no review of student performance on the PLOs  
- Results of assessment are not discussed or are minimally discussed among faculty and stakeholder engagement is absent or limited | - Program reviews student performance against outcomes but not on a regular or routinized basis  
- Results of assessment are discussed, among faculty with minimal engagement of other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field) | - Program has a regular or established process for reviewing student performance against outcomes (i.e., routinized process)  
- Broad-based engagement of faculty and instructional staff  
- Results of assessment are discussed among faculty and shared on a regular basis with other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field) as appropriate  
- The program may have an especially distinctive, creative, or innovative way of approaching assessment |
| Continuous Improvement | - No curriculum, instructional, or programmatic changes were made  
- No reflection on action items from the prior PAR | - Limited description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program’s development or performance  
- The program did not make at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change  
- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed  
- Ratings of no evidence or beginning from the last review have not been addressed | - Improvements are described and examples are provided that draw general connections to previous action plans  
- The program made at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change  
- Clear rationale is not provided for newly identified actions  
- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed  
- Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were at least partially addressed | - The program implemented 2-4 curricular, instructional or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report; specific improvements are described and examples are provided  
- Actions from the prior report that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated / replaced are briefly described  
- Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., other improvements made based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was provided  
- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report or self-identified improvements were addressed  
- Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were specifically addressed (i.e., actions were taken to move the program forward) |
| Curriculum Map | No curriculum map was provided | - A limited number of PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum OR all of the PLOs are mapped to only one required course or experience  
- UG Programs Only: Program has not mapped the connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum | - A majority of the PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum  
- Map does not identify degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses  
- UG Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its | - All of the PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum  
- Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each PLO  
- Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.  
- Other learning experience (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified |
Rubric for Evaluating Program Assessment Reports: Template II (updated to reflect PAR adjustments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Intended Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>* Learner-centered statements of what students will know, do, and become as a result of completing the program (e.g., students will [action verb]). See Bloom’s Taxonomy.</td>
<td>- PLOs not functional (e.g. incomplete, overly detailed, disorganized, or not measurable) - Describe a process or delivery of education (i.e., what the instructor does for students) rather than intended student learning (i.e., what the intended result is to be) - Do not address the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the cumulative effect of the program</td>
<td>- Written in a way that they can be measured - Most outcomes are clearly defined or the meaning is easily discernible - Most outcomes are written as learner-centered statements - Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline - Focus is too narrow to represent the cumulative effect of the program</td>
<td>- Written in a way that they can be measured - All outcomes are written as learner-centered statements with action verbs - The outcomes are clearly defined - Encompass program, college, and university mission and goals - Align with professional standards, as appropriate. - Focus on the cumulative effect of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures (the evidence that is used to evaluate outcomes achievement)</td>
<td>No evidence presented of measures used</td>
<td>- Measures apply to too many outcomes at once - Few or no direct measures used. - Methods are mismatched, inappropriate, or otherwise do not provide evidence linked to the intended learning outcomes</td>
<td>- At least one measure per outcome - A variety of direct and indirect measures used to assess outcomes - The evidence used is mostly linked to the intended outcomes - Measures section lacks clear description and detail</td>
<td>- Multiple measures for at least some outcomes - Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct (i.e., data gathered is primarily focused on student learning activities) - Purposeful and clear how results could be used for program improvement - Measures section is described in sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td>No findings or analysis presented</td>
<td>- Results/findings lack specificity, - Lack of connection between the outcomes, the data gathered, and the results reported - Degree of proficiency met is unclear</td>
<td>- Some findings are reported that address outcomes and evaluate student achievement of them. - Degree of proficiency met is included</td>
<td>- Complete, concise, and well organized; provides statements summarizing the data finding(s), the meanings, and conclusions based on these finding(s) - Aligned with proficiency targets as appropriate - Includes interpretation of the degree to which desired outcomes were met - Compares new findings with past results, where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned based on Findings</td>
<td>No evidence presented of actions taken or planned</td>
<td>Limited evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc.</td>
<td>Some evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc.</td>
<td>Actions or plans have been implemented and documented and/or detailed plans for implementation have been provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* NOTE: You will refer back to these action items in your next PAR.</td>
<td>- No actions are documented; or there are too many plans to reasonably manage</td>
<td>- At least one concrete action has been documented or planned with relevant details, timelines, etc.</td>
<td>- Actions or plans clearly follow from assessment results and state directly which finding(s) motivated the action</td>
<td>- Actions or plans define logical “next steps”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>