TABLE: Program Self-Assessments of PLO[1] Assessment Reports. In the tables that follow, each undergraduate major, stand alone minor, graduate program and Core 1 report the level of development of their 2009 PLO Assessment Report using the UC Merced *Rubric for the Report on PLO Assessment*. Programs appear in alphabetical order by name. Empty cells reflect program responses.

[1] Program Learning Outcome

RUBRIC FOR REPORT ON PLO ASSESSMENT

Center for Research on Teaching Excellence

	Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
ASSESSMENT METHODS	**Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)**	PLO does not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning (vague, immeasurable verb statements like "students understand major theories"). No rubric developed.	PLO indicates how students can demonstrate learning. Action verb may be general and the PLO may not be observable or measurable. Assessment criteria[1] have not been identified or are incomplete. Rubric in early stages of development.	PLO describes how students can demonstrate learning, identifying observable and measurable results. Criteria are articulated in the form of a rubric, criteria and standards[1] may need further development to be more meaningful and consistently applied.	PLO specifically describes how students can demonstrate learning. Rubric clearly articulates explicit criteria and standards[1] for assessing the PLO, identifies the most important aspects of student learning, and includes descriptions of student performance at varying levels.
	Valid Evidence	It is not clear that potentially valid evidence is collected for the PLO and/or individual faculty use personalized rather than programmatic criteria and standards[1] to assess student work or performance.	Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for the PLO but may not include both direct and indirect forms. Evidence needs to be further focused or aligned with PLO or emerging criteria to produce truly meaningful and useful results.	Faculty collect relevant & sufficient evidence for each outcome, including both indirect and direct evidence. Assessment instruments (ex. rubric) assess the level of student attainment. Evidence is aligned with the PLO and assessment criteria to enable meaningful results and conclusions.	Assessment criteria have been pilot-tested and refined over time, usually shared with students. Direct and indirect evidence are designed to mutually inform conclusions. Feedback has led to refinements in the assessment process.
	Reliable Results	Reviewers of student work are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way; there are no checks for inter-rater reliability	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.	Reviewers are calibrated, and faculty routinely find assessment data to have high inter-rater reliability.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	**Results Summary**	Results (data table or other means) are not included in report.	Results (data table or other means) are included but unclear or missing key data.	Results clearly delineated for each line of evidence in tabular or other summary formats. May reference benchmarks or other expectations.	Results clearly delineate each line of evidence, indicating various levels of achievement. Includes benchmarks.
	Conclusions & Recommendations	Report identifies implications but no recommendations for improvement in student learning or assessment practices and no explanation of how these claims are derived. No reasoning offered in support of claims.	Report identifies some conclusions, implications, and recommendations for improvements regarding student learning or assessment, but the claims are vague or questionably related to results. Support for claims is occasionally insufficient. Questions of validity or reliability are not discussed. Results may be discussed by limited number of faculty, recommendations may be difficult to implement due to lack of convincing results and/or limited faculty involvement or support.	Report clearly articulates conclusions, implications and recommendations for improvement regarding both student learning and assessment and which could be drawn from results. Includes some consideration of the reliability and validity of results. May offer vague support for some claims. Results have been discussed by many faculty and recommendations likely to be implemented due to faculty involvement and support and quality of assessment work.	Report articulates a well-reasoned critique of conclusions, implications, and recommendations that could be drawn from the results for both student learning and assessment. Includes a well-reasoned discussion of validity and reliability of results. Faculty discuss results, plan needed changes, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. Efforts to collaborate with others, such as librarians or student affairs professionals, to improve results.

[1] Criteria are the specific skills or abilities to be measured. Standards describe the levels of performance for a given criterion (ex. proficient to exemplary).

Authored by Laura E. Martin and Anne Zanzucchi, Center for Research on Teaching Excellence, University of California, Merced, based on rubrics by C. Jenefsky & JFKU Program Review Council (2008) and WASC (2007).

RUBRIC FOR REPORT ON PLO ASSESSMENT

Center for Research on Teaching Excellence

This rubric has five major criteria:

(1) **Assessable Program Learning Outcomes**: Program learning outcome should be reasonable and appropriate for the degree level. If national disciplinary standards are available, the PLO may reflect those priorities. To be assessable, it should involve specific, active verbs with supporting details describing how students will demonstrate their learning. For instance, avoid verbs of general cognition such as "know" or "understand" and instead use verbs like "demonstrate by" or "solve" that show how learning is applied. Through discussion of examples of student work and perhaps course-specific rubrics used by faculty, faculty groups have agreed on explicit criteria[2] and elaborated a program-level rubric. For more information, see <http://crte.ucmerced.edu/program-learning-outcomes-resources>.

(2) **Valid Evidence**: To be valid, evidence must be discussed among faculty and aligned with both the expectation(s) described by the PLO and the criteria[2] faculty use to evaluate student learning. Valid evidence is also linked to sample size or sampling approach, so as to be representative of a norm. For more information, see the appended selection on sample sizing from Linda Suskie's *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide* (2004).

(3) **Reliable Results**: Reliable results stem from agreement among faculty about the standards[2] used to evaluate student work, usually as articulated in a faculty-developed, program-wide rubric. Agreement about how to apply these standards in the evaluation of student work (i.e. calibration) is rooted in discussion and practice. Some questions to consider are: How do faculty promote calibration? How do faculty check for calibration? I.e. when faculty apply a rubric to student work, how consistently do they reach the same conclusions (i.e. exhibit inter-rater reliability)? If results are inconsistent, how can inter-rater reliability be improved?

(4) **Summarizing Results**: When drafting a results chart (data table or other means), it is important to consider multiple audiences. How would faculty within your department understand the results? If viewed by outside stake-holders like students, faculty from other programs, administrators, parents, etc., would they reach similar conclusions? Comparing the results to previous results in your program, expectations your program has set for student learning, or to results of similar programs within or outside of the UC (i.e. benchmarking) can provide context for interpreting the results.

(5) **Conclusions and Recommendations**: An effective conclusion closes the loop by analyzing results and implementing change. The narrative should address some probable conclusions based on the results. For example, if students were not given a clear incentive to participate in a particular assessment, the results may not be completely reliable as students may not have been motivated to perform at their best. Specific actions and a timeline for implementation should also be provided since the goal is to gather data to improve both student learning and the ability to engage in effective assessment. Changes might include improving the assessment process or curriculum, examining curriculum content in support of skill development, changing pedagogical practices, stimulating faculty discussion, simply re-examining program learning outcomes, or identifying ways student support services (tutoring, advising, the library) might contribute to increased student success.

---

[2] Criteria are the specific skills or abilities to be measured. Standards describe the levels of performance for a given criterion (ex. proficient to exemplary) and in doing so enable their measurement.

Authored by Laura E. Martin and Anne Zanzucchi, Center for Research on Teaching Excellence, University of California, Merced, based on rubrics by C. Jenefsky & JFKU Program Review Council (2008) and WASC (2007).

Anthropology, B.A. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	PLO describes how students can demonstrate learning, identifying observable and measurable results. Criteria are articulated in the form of a rubric, criteria and standards may need further development to be more meaningful and consistently applied.
Valid Evidence	Emerging	Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for the PLO but may not include both direct and indirect forms. Evidence needs to be further focused or aligned with PLO or emerging criteria to produce truly meaningful and useful results.
Reliable Results	Emerging	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way or faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.
Results Summary	Developed	Results clearly delineated for each line of evidence in a tabular or other summary formats. May reference benchmarks or other expectations.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	Report clearly articulates conclusions, implications and recommendations for improvement regarding both student learning and assessment and which could be drawn from results. Includes some consideration of the reliability and validity of results. May offer vague support for some claims. Results have been discussed by many faculty and recommendations likely to be implemented due to faculty involvement and support and quality of assessment work.

Applied Mathematics, B.S. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)		The faculty agree strongly that the current program learning outcomes represent a good first attempt at encapsulating a practical realizable set of outcomes for their expectations of students in the program. The language used to articulate these outcomes emphasizes correctly that the applied mathematics faculty are dedicated to enabling students to become effective problem-solvers versed well in both analytical and computational methods (PLO's 1 and 2). The faculty agree that solving an applied mathematics problem requires a broad view that includes a strong knowledge-base of the application area to which the solution serves (PLO's 3 and 5). And finally, the faculty is committed to teaching students effective communication skills that are essential for presenting findings and results to the broadest possible audience so that their work can have the most impact possible (PLO 4). The initial assessment presented here has provided the applied mathematics faculty a beneficial test of their program learning outcomes. Overall, the applied mathematics faculty agrees still that the program learning outcomes are reasonable and appropriate. However, the applied mathematics faculty has learned a great deal about their specific expectations of students through this assessment exercise. In particular, the applied mathematics faculty has revised their explicit criteria in the course rubrics. This revision will undoubtedly lead to new approaches in teaching that enable students better to fulfill the program learning outcomes.
Valid Evidence		Collecting and evaluating embedded questions is clearly the most sensible choice for evidence. This evidence provides the applied mathematics faculty a direct line to students' abilities and skills. At the same time, the student focus group provided valuable insight into students' perceptions of the program learning outcomes that the applied mathematics faculty did not always anticipate. The combination of these direct and indirect methods for collecting evidence proved to be essential for a comprehensive initial assessment. The major challenge in acquiring valid evidence for assessment is probably the sample size. The Applied Mathematical Sciences program is not a big program. Moreover, this program is still in its infancy. Thus, the faculty must work with small sample sizes that may not be appropriate for extrapolating to a broad view of this program. On the other hand, the applied mathematics faculty enjoys this current situation in which they have the ability to work with students on an individual basis. Again, the applied mathematics faculty feels strongly that this situation has led to the student statement in the focus group discussion that "faculty were always available to help." It will become clearer as the faculty conduct future assessments that their view of the evidence will take on a broader view because the program will grow.

Applied Mathematics, B.S. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Reliable Results		Since this report discusses our very first formal assessment of the Applied Mathematical Sciences program, the applied mathematics faculty is still developing a collective understanding of the standards in evaluating the program. Just by reflecting on the revision of the rubric used to evaluate the embedded questions, the applied mathematics faculty has reached a new understanding that this calibration process will be dynamic and on-going. Certainly, this initial assessment provided the means to begin this discussion.
Results Summary		An important issue that the applied mathematics faculty will take on in the near future is communicating their assessment results on their lower division service courses to the other programs to whom those courses serve. The faculty hopes to develop a collaborative effort in which faculty and students from other programs participate in this very large assessment effort. Moreover, the faculty hopes that in conducting this assessment, they can achieve even more alignment with the goals of other programs on campus, thereby strengthening the overall mission of this university.
Conclusions & Recommendations		The applied mathematics faculty is fortunate to have a student body who participated actively in this initial assessment. Because of this participation, the applied mathematics faculty was able to derive a great deal of information from this initial assessment. Indeed, student participation is essential for meaningful assessment. For future assessments, the applied mathematics faculty will develop concrete incentives for student participation. The applied mathematics faculty is dedicated to conducting transparent assessments to which students, faculty and staff have access. To that end, the applied mathematics faculty will develop more inclusive methods for conducting assessments that encourage more participation and yield a deeper sense of ownership among the stakeholders of this program. A critical component of this endeavor will be opening up communication channels and extending dialogues with students, staff and faculty. The applied mathematics will be developing methods for achieving these goals in the near future.

Biology, B.S.

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Emerging	In this area, we are probably in the "Emerging" category, although leaning toward Developed. Although our PLO1 may be considered a bit "vague", it does explicitly demand that students demonstrate certain categories of knowledge. In theory, this could be reasonably assessed by various means, including student responses on exam questions. However, the criteria for this PLO were not articulated in the form of a rubric (as mentioned for a "developed" PLO), and it is likely that a student would have difficulty carrying out concrete steps to ensure compliance with this PLO, even if the student had been given the PLO ahead of time.
Valid Evidence	Emerging	We believe we are in the "Emerging" category in this area. We had a great deal of discussion regarding how to collect valid data, but only obtained direct evidence (not indirect) as the rubric indicates. The evidence was not entirely aligned with the PLO due to lack of knowledge and planning regarding how to work with faculty to obtain optimal, assessable exam questions to evaluate. Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for the PLO but may not include both direct and indirect forms. Evidence needs to be further focused or aligned with PLO or emerging criteria to produce truly meaningful and useful results.
Reliable Results	Emerging/Developed	In this category, we are between Emerging and Developed. The faculty did attempt to carefully calibrate assessment criteria and apply them in a uniform manner. We also did check for inter-rater reliability. This all would suggest that we are "Developed". However, we are hesitant to claim a "Developed" status when in fact despite our best efforts, there some disagreement between the faculty raters of the student responses, and overall we feel that improvement should be achieved in future years in terms of reliability of results.
Results Summary	Emerging/Developed	In this category, we are again between Emerging and Developed. We have provided a table of key results (Table 1) and explain these results. However, in the future we would like to have more types of results with clear tabulation of each and explanation of how they relate to each other. So although we believe our Table and Results are adequate, there is clearly room for improvement.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	In this area we hope we are Developed, because we do have specific suggestions on how the Outcome could be better achieved in the future. However, the most important way to determine if we have success in this area is whether we are able to convince the faculty to consider our suggestions and act on them. It is possible that our suggestions are not the best ones, but if we can successfully spur a faculty debate and get faculty action, that is the most desirable outcome.

Biology, B.S.

Chemistry, B.S. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Emerging	PLO indicates how students can demonstrate learning but assessment criteria are incomplete.
Valid Evidence	Emerging	Faculty have agreed on both direct and indirect forms of evidence but the evidence does not produce meaningful results.
Reliable Results	Emerging	Reviewers are not calibrated but inter-rater reliability is checked.
Results Summary	Developed	Results are clearly delineated for each line of evidence.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	Report makes conclusions and recommendations, but reliability and validity of recommended changes remains to be determined.

Cognitive Science, B.A. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	
Valid Evidence	Emerging	The PLO has an associated rubric that is explicitly linked with a research proposal that has components aligned with the rubric. The PLO is not yet highly developed, and its evidence base is still emerging, because there is no indirect evidence associated with it. However, indirect evidence may not be necessary to fully assess this PLO (to be further considered as assessment activities develop).
Reliable Results	Developed	Two faculty members independently rated research proposals according to the rubric, after conferring to formulate the rubric and calibrate their interpretation of it. Inter-rater reliability was calculated and found to be relatively high.
Results Summary	Developed	Ratings were tabulated and reported for individual students as well as group averages. This first time assessing the PLO will act as a benchmark for future assessment.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	Results suggested some areas of instructional improvement, and sampling of research proposals was addressed, but validity of results was not discussed. However, validity would appear to be a minor issue because learning outcomes are clearly and directly reflected in components of the research proposal.

Core 1

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	Although the PLOs are measurable, we can do more to focus the rubric and so improve instructor consensus and hence classroom instruction.
Valid Evidence	Developed	Varied, cumulative, holistic evidence from student performance and student/instructor feedback.
Reliable Results	Emerging	Calibration needs improvement.
Results Summary	Developed	Charts to indicate results, although data could be further aligned with assessment criteria/calibration.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	Results have been reviewed carefully and faculty engaged with stages of assessment process. Nevertheless, implications continue to become apparent, and will be noted as necessary in subsequent reports.

Environmental Engineering, B.S.

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	PLO 2 was deemed relatively well-developed with respect to this criterion, although relatively broad in its coverage. It will require synthesizing information from several courses and/or different assignments to capture all of this PLO's intended aspects. A case in point is the failure to obtain useful information regarding the development of team-based problem-solving skills in this assessment.
Valid Evidence	Emerging	This aspect of the EnvE PLO-2 assessment was judged to be emerging. As noted the student work provided by the instructors was, for the most part, valid as direct lines of evidence. However, development in this area is needed in terms of better PLO coverage (team-based problem solving), and the inclusion of alternative lines of evidence (e.g., indirect).
Reliable Results	Initial	This aspect of the PLO-2 assessment was deemed to be only in its initial phase of development because no evidence of inter-rater comparisons or other calibration methods was provided to the FAO; all grading appears to have been done by the instructors themselves. Also, the class size is small for all cases examined, and it may take several course offerings to indentify useful trends.
Results Summary	Emerging	This aspect was rated as emerging as this report does provide results in tabular and quantitative forms. However, a more highly developed reporting style would be transferrable to other courses and make results comparable from year to year.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	This aspect was rated as developed because the report did draw conclusions where possible and served the purpose of identifying major short-comings in the EnvE PLO assessment process.

Environmental Systems, M.S. and Ph.D.

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Emerging	
Valid Evidence	Developed	
Reliable Results	Initial	
Results Summary	Emerging	
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	

History, B.A. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	The PLO we chose refers to ways in which students are able to demonstrate learning skills related to the evaluation of primary and secondary sources. We developed a rubric but it needs further modification, as discussed above.
Valid Evidence	Developed	We obtained evidence in the form of senior theses, and our rubric assessed the levels of student competence in each category. The evidence chosen, the senior thesis paper, was the most appropriate evidence we could use to collect meaningful data.
Reliable Results	Developed	Our results were reliable within the context of the fact that we were evaluating narrative, which is by nature subjective and difficult to reduce to a rubric. This was our first assessment exercise, which provided us with a baseline with which to further modify our assessment criteria in order to ensure uniformity.
Results Summary	Developed	The results of our assessment appear above in a number of tabular and summary formats in order to facilitate evaluation of student achievements.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	Our history program has met and discussed the results of this assessment report. We have made specific recommendations regarding changes that need to be made in the HIST 191 course, both in terms of how it is taught and in terms of revising the assignment. We have had discussions about the problem regarding using a rubric to evaluate narrative. Further discussions are scheduled to continue our plans and assessments. Our faculty are not only enthusiastic and deeply committed to student learning, but excited about the changes that we are making to the program.

Literatures & Cultures, B.A. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	The criteria are clear and measurable. Caveat: the degree to which individual courses articulate the program outcomes is emerging, which undercuts the ability of students to understand clearly how to achieve the program outcomes.
Valid Evidence	English track: Developed Spanish track: Emerging	Developed for the English Language track; emerging for the Spanish, in that we have relevant and sufficient evidence in the one case and not in the other. Even though the rubric needs refinement, it works in assessing the level of student attainment.
Reliable Results	Developed	As this category is articulated in language I don't understand (I understand how to calibrate machines, but not reviewers!), I can't evaluate our status well. We have not yet run our assessment with multiple reviewers, but we have expertise and experience in ensuring inter-rater reliability. On that point, I'd put us at developed.
Results Summary		
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	The pilot suggests that we'll reach the "developed" level quickly, but we need actually to assess an on the evidence we most need in order to be able to evaluate this section well.

Mechanical Engineering, B.S.

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Emerging	
Valid Evidence	Emerging	
Reliable Results	Initial	
Results Summary	Emerging	
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	

Media Arts Program (MAP), Arts Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Emerging/Developed	Media Arts Program falls somewhere between “emerging” and “developed”. It is clear that employing uniform quantitative assessments will aid in developing the observable and measurable results that the “developed” rubric requires. The fact that art technique has directly observable standard and that all instructors are highly qualified to observe it is a positive quality that needs to be developed and augmented with tabular ort other summary format.
Valid Evidence	Emerging/Developed	Media Arts Program again falls somewhere between “emerging” and “developed”. Faculty has collected valuable and valid evidence. However, there has only been individual and internal evaluation while it is necessary to have external evaluation as well.
Reliable Results	Initial	Media Arts Program is only in the “initial” state. There are no uniform assessment criteria. Assessment of PLO #2 will meet uniform assessment criteria.
Results Summary	Emerging	Media Arts Program is “emerging”. There is no tabular or graphic format included. FAO will need assistance with this otherwise the rubric will not be met.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	

Natural Sciences Education Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Highly Developed	The current PLOs of the program are *highly developed* since they clearly articulate and provide measurable criteria for assessing students learning. However, as the program grows and more coursework is added additional PLOs might have to be developed. For example, as more discipline specific pedagogy curriculum is introduced corresponding PLOs and criteria will have to be provided.
Valid Evidence	Developed	The evidence gathered includes both direct and indirect measurements and provides sufficient information to assess each PLO, so this aspect of the rubric is *developed.* With time the particular surveys and tests will be refined further and additional dimensions will be added to the assessment to make it more comprehensive.
Reliable Results	Emerging	The system of correlating results from different portions of the assessment needs more development to insure the inter-rater reliability. More structured and correlated results section will result in more comprehensive and clearly delineated results summary. More staff resources and communication between staff of the program will be required to further develop and implement these aspects of the assessment. Overall both of these assessment aspects [reliable results and results summary] are rated as *emerging.*
Results Summary	Emerging	The system of correlating results from different portions of the assessment needs more development to insure the inter-rater reliability. More structured and correlated results section will result in more comprehensive and clearly delineated results summary. More staff resources and communication between staff of the program will be required to further develop and implement these aspects of the assessment. . Overall both of these assessment aspects [reliable results and results summary] are rated as *emerging.*
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	The assessment clearly articulated recommendations and paths to program improvement and the implementation of the least-resources-demanding recommendations have already begun. This portion of the rubric is evaluated as *developed.*

Philosophy Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	The PLO is clearly described in its constituent parts, and each part specifically indicates which skill the student is to cultivate in terms of learning applications.
Valid Evidence	Developed	Data gathered in general match one to one with the various parts of the PLO and are in quantifiable form. More data need to be gathered that directly correspond with part (2) of the PLO.
Reliable Results	Emerging	The current qualitative assessment methods are entirely consistent across philosophy faculty members. However, a significantly larger body of data is needed in order to allow the generation of assessment summaries that are perfectly calibrated among different reviewers.
Results Summary	Emerging	Results are complete in the sense that no data are missing, but the sample size is too small to warrant valid statistical conclusions or to establish clear benchmarks.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Emerging	

Physics, B.S. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Developed	PLO describes how students can demonstrate learning, identifying observable and measurable results. Criteria are articulated in the form of a rubric, criteria and standards may need further development to be more meaningful and consistently applied.
Valid Evidence	Emerging	Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for the PLO but may not include both direct and indirect forms. Evidence needs to be further focused or aligned with PLO or emerging criteria to produce truly meaningful and useful results. As the Physics program matures, a larger body of evidence will become available. Also, the exam questions used to evaluate PLO #1 will become better measuring sticks as faculty become more familiar with the assessment protocol.
Reliable Results	Developed	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability. Consistency of results will improve as we have more faculty to participate in the assessment, and as faculty become more familiar with assessment protocols and expectations.
Results Summary	Developed	Results clearly delineated for each line of evidence in tabular or other summary formats. May reference benchmarks or other expectations.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	Report clearly articulates conclusions, implications and recommendations for improvement regarding both student learning and assessment and which could be drawn from results. Includes some consideration of the reliability and validity of results. May offer vague support for some claims. Results have been discussed by many faculty and recommendations likely to be implemented due to faculty involvement and support and quality of assessment work. in support of claims.As the quality and quantity of the data we collect increases, we will continue to hone our understanding of specific deficiencies and appropriate remedies.

Political Science, B.A.

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Initial/Emerging	PLO #1 does not specifically state how students can demonstrate attainment. Note that it is very difficult to state this type of PLO in a more specific and obviously measureable manner.
Valid Evidence	Emerging/Developed	Meets the "Developed" definition with the exception that there was not a formal rubric used.
Reliable Results	Developed	The Committee and Political Science faculty engaged in conversations about how to calibrate the measurement of attainment and both members of the Committee checked each other's evaluations of attainment.
Results Summary	Emerging/Developed	Evidence is clearly displayed, but not in tabular format.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed/Highly Developed	Specific conclusions, implications, and resulting recommendations are articulated and have been discussed with the entire political science faculty.

Sociology, B.A. and Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Highly Developed	PLO explicitly describes how students can demonstrate learning. We employed a rubric to assess the PLO that identifies key aspects of student learning and describes student performance at varying levels.
Valid Evidence	Developed	Faculty collected relevant and sufficient evidence. Rubric assesses the level of student attainment. Evidence is aligned with PLO and assessment criteria to enable meaningful results. Assessment criteria have not been pilot tested and refined over time, nor shared with students, since this is a new program.
Reliable Results	Highly Developed	Reviewers jointly created rubric to calibrate assessments, and faculty assessments had high inter-rater reliability.
Results Summary	Highly Developed	Results are clearly delineated for each line of evidence in tabular format. Results for subgroups of students are compared as a benchmark and report references faculty expectations.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Highly Developed	Conclusions, implications, and recommendations are clearly discussed and linked to results. All faculty discuss the validity and reliability of results and participate in the planning process related to necessary changes, bringing in relevant stakeholders (librarians, deans, etc) as needed to implement changes.

Spanish Minor

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Highly Developed	Writing is an outcome that is assessable. Our rubric clearly articulates explicit criteria and standards for assessing.
Valid Evidence	Developed	Faculty collected relevant and sufficient evidence for the outcome, including both direct and indirect evidence. Assessment instruments measure the level that students attained.
Reliable Results	Developed	Reviewers are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in a uniform way and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.
Results Summary	Highly Developed	Results clearly delineate each line of evidence, indicating various levels of achievement.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	Report clearly articulates conclusions, implications and recommendations for implementation regarding both student learning and assessment and which could be drawn from results.

Merritt Writing Program

Criteria	Self-Assessed Level of Development	Explanation of Self-Assessment
Assessable Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Emerging	Rubric is in early stages of development; otherwise the PLO itself is measurable.
Valid Evidence	Developed	Varied evidence (direct & indirect).
Reliable Results	Emerging	Calibration needs improvement.
Results Summary	Developed	Clear charts to indicate data trends.
Conclusions & Recommendations	Developed	Results have been reviewed carefully and faculty engaged with stages of assessment process.