**Academic Program Assessment Continuous Improvement of Student Learning Rubric**

**Program Name/College**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ] **No Evidence** | [ ] **Minimal Evidence** | [ ] **Evidence** | [ ] **Clear Evidence** | [ ] **Advanced** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| [ ] No information provided for current assessment year |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| [ ] Described program improvements without linking to assessment results |
| **OR**[ ] Analyzed data and decided not to make improvements |
| **OR**[ ] Described assessment data collection without providing sufficient evidence of the use of results to improve student learning or program improvement |
| **OR**[ ] No assessment information provided for current year; however, described prior assessment results with reference to closing the loop |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| [ ] Analyzed and used student learning outcomes assessment results and determined that changes are not needed at this time. Program explained why changes were not needed and described next steps or follow-up assessment |
| **OR**Analyzed and used program information or data to inform changes intended to improve student learning by:[ ] enhancing or revising curriculum[ ] developing instructional strategies [ ] conducting professional development activities[ ] improving assessment processes[ ] improving academic support services |
| **OR**[ ] Met Minimal Evidence (1) and discussed **prior** progress report results or assessment efforts and provided clear evidence of following up and assessing the identified change to determine if student learning improved |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| Analyzed and used direct student learning outcomes assessment results to inform changes intended to improve student learning by:[ ] enhancing or revising curriculum[ ] developing instructional strategies [ ] conducting professional development activities[ ] improving assessment processes[ ] improving academic support services**AND**[ ] Described why changes were needed and indicated next steps or follow-up assessment |
| **OR**[ ] Met Evidence (2) and discussed **prior** progress report results or assessment efforts and provided clear evidence of following up and assessing the identified change to determine if student learning improved |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| Analyzed and used direct student learning outcomes assessment resultsto inform changes intended to improve student learning by:[ ] enhancing or revising curriculum[ ] developing instructional strategies [ ] conducting professional development activities[ ] improving assessment processesimproving academic support services**AND**[ ] Described why changes were needed and indicated next steps or follow-up assessment**AND**[ ] Discussed prior progress report results or assessment efforts and provided clear evidence of following up and assessing the identified change to determine if student learning improved |

 |
|
|
| * **No Evidence (0)**
 | * **Minimal Evidence (1)**
 | * **Evidence (2)**
 | * **Clear Evidence (3)**
 | * **Advanced (4)**
 |
| **Overall Comments:**  |

**Academic Program Assessment Continuous Improvement of Student Learning Rubric**

# ***Overview***

RIT is committed to ensuring academic quality and continuous progress or improvement in student learning. Annually, RIT academic programs are asked to provide evidence that assessment results were used to improve student learning and guide program improvements. The rubric outlines the conditions programs must meet to effectively demonstrate systematic assessment of student learning and continuous improvement.

# ***Definitions***

**Continuous Improvement:** Systematic use of data to improve student learning and guide planning, decisions, and improvements to the academic program

**Direct Assessment of Learning** occurs when measures of learning are based on student performance or demonstrates the learning itself. Scoring performance on tests, projects, written assignments, or the execution of lab skills are examples of direct assessment of learning

**Indirect Assessment of Learning** uses perceptions, reflections or secondary evidence to make inferences about student learning. Surveys of students’ perceptions, course grades, focus groups, and self-assessment are considered indirect evidence of learning

**Program Assessment Data**: Information or data collected from all or a sample of students in the program – alumni surveys, student satisfaction surveys, exit surveys. Program information tends to come from indirect sources as evidence of meeting broader program goals

**Student Learning Assessment Data**: Information or data collected from embedded assessments in courses. Usually course-level information that comes from direct sources (tests, projects, essays) and measures the achievement of the program’s goals and student learning outcomes

# ***Framing Language***

This rubric is designed to holistically assess academic programs’ use of data to continuously improve student learning and guide program improvements. In order for academic programs to demonstrate continuous improvement, each programs annual progress report must include:

* a clearly articulated student learning outcome
* a benchmark
* an implemented strategy to achieve the outcome
* evidence of analysis of the data
* how the program used the results to improve student learning and guide program improvements

RIT academic programs share many common attributes including demonstrating continuous improvement, but we acknowledge each program has unique student learning outcomes and assessment methods appropriate to their curriculum. The rubric provides a holistic approach to identifying and determining continuous improvement for academic programs at RIT. This process is designed to be formative as academic programs will receive feedback on how well the unit demonstrates continuous improvement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
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