

Academic Program Assessment and Action Plan Rubric

The Academic Program Assessment and Action Plan rubric focuses on the quality of student learning outcomes assessment for academic programs at Syracuse University. This feedback rubric is not intended to evaluate how well academic programs are performing; rather, it is designed to support faculty in reflecting through the assessment and action planning process for continuous program improvement. Each component of the University's assessment and action plan template is incorporated in the rubric. A sustainability component is provided first, setting the expectation that each academic program sustains a well-designed and manageable assessment plan and process to inform decision-making.

Please note: The yellow highlighted statements in Results and Interpretation represent new expectations from the University's institutional accreditor, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), for "consideration and use of disaggregated assessment results for all student populations for the improvement of student learning outcomes, student achievement, and institutional and program-level educational effectiveness." University expectations will be evolving to reflect this new direction but are not taken into account this year.

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
Sustaining Assessment	No documentation that ongoing program-level assessment activity is occurring.	Expectations for sustaining program-level assessment are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more student learning outcomes are examined by faculty each academic year and documented through the annual assessment and action plan update. The entire set of outcomes are assessed over Syracuse University's four-year assessment cycle. Results are shared, discussed, and analyzed by a subset of faculty or by committee. Assessment processes are a regular part of the program's functioning to inform decision-making. 	<p>"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are discussed and actions identified and implemented with the opportunity for all faculty members to provide input. Students are actively engaged and participate in the assessment process. 	Faculty should self-assess where their programs are in the process of implementing student learning outcomes assessment and action planning.

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
Student Learning Outcomes	Student learning outcomes are not provided.	Expectations for student learning outcomes are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty identify clear statements of essential student learning outcomes that describe what students will be able to do, know, or produce by the end of the academic program. The assessment and action plan includes 5-7 student learning outcomes for a baccalaureate, master's, or doctoral program. The assessment and action plan includes 3-4 student learning outcomes for an undergraduate certificate, stand-alone minor, or certificate of advanced study. Programs with specialized accreditation may have prescribed learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes for undergraduate programs are aligned to the Shared Competencies, 	<p>"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All student learning outcomes are written using active verbs and are measurable. Student learning outcomes describe challenging expectations of student learning in the program. 	

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
			Syracuse University’s university-wide learning goals.		
Curriculum Map	Curriculum map is not provided.	Expectations for the curriculum map are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The academic program’s curriculum map uses the University’s scale (I=Introduce, R=Reinforce, M=Master) to show how student learning outcomes are addressed in the courses and experiences that make up the curriculum. The map demonstrates the progression of learning across the curriculum with a combination of I, R, and M ratings. 	<p>“Meets Expectations” indicators are met. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures that may potentially be used to examine each student learning outcome are included on the map. The map shows sufficient opportunities for students to develop the learning outcomes, demonstrating strong program coherence. 	
Measures	Measures are not provided.	Expectations for measures are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty examine a student learning outcome using a minimum of two measures, one of which is student work. The description of each measure is clearly linked to the student learning outcome being assessed. 	<p>“Meets Expectations” indicators are met. Plus, any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty use two measures of student work, providing direct evidence of student performance on the outcome. Faculty use more than two measures. Measures involving student grades or scores are supplemented with faculty observations of student strengths and areas where they are underperforming. 	
Criteria	Criteria are not provided.	Expectations for criteria are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each measure, faculty establish a criterion that defines the performance level representing minimally acceptable achievement of the learning outcome. The benchmark for success seems reasonably set. 	<p>“Meets Expectations” indicator is met. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty set criteria, such as one criterion for acceptable achievement and a second one for the proportion of students from whom faculty would like to see exemplary work. 	
Results	Evidence of student learning is not provided.	Expectations for results are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of results is consistent with the measures and criteria identified for the student learning outcome. For each measure, results are clearly summarized. Results are disaggregated in ways that are meaningful to the program for the improvement of learning outcomes for all students. 	<p>“Meets Expectations” indicators are met. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In describing the results of student work, faculty record the number of students who “exceeded,” “met,” “partially met,” and “did not meet” the criteria. 	
Interpretation	Interpretation of results by faculty is not provided.	Expectations for interpretation are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty’s interpretation aligns with the results and is comprehensively documented. In considering student work, findings summarize strengths and areas where students are underperforming relative to the learning outcome. Disaggregating results for the improvement of 	<p>“Meets Expectations” indicators are met, and disaggregated results are discussed in the narrative. Plus, any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty compare results over a few years to determine consistency of findings. 	

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
			<p>learning outcomes for all students in the program are considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary of non-course-based measures may also consider strengths and areas for improvement of programmatic operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty incorporate prior evidence in a longitudinal analysis of student performance to determine impact of actions. Faculty explore other questions of interest in the context of the student learning outcome. 	
Action & Follow-Up	Information about actions is not provided.	Expectations for actions are partially met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on results and interpretation, faculty identify and implement actions to improve the academic program and/or the assessment process OR faculty determine that an action is not necessary other than to “maintain assessment strategy.” 	<p>“Meets Expectations” indicators are met. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress updates are provided for each action identified and implemented by faculty. The student learning outcome is reassessed to determine the impact of the action(s). 	

Overall Comments: