

Program Name/College _____

No Evidence	Minimal Evidence	Evidence	Clear Evidence	Advanced
<input type="checkbox"/> No information provided for current assessment year	<input type="checkbox"/> Described program improvements without linking to assessment results OR <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data and decided not to make improvements OR <input type="checkbox"/> Described assessment data collection without providing sufficient evidence of the use of results to improve student learning or program improvement OR <input type="checkbox"/> No assessment information provided for current year; however, described looking back on prior assessment results with reference to closing the loop	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed and used program information or data to inform changes intended to improve student learning by: <input type="checkbox"/> enhancing or revising curriculum <input type="checkbox"/> developing instructional strategies or conducting professional development activities <input type="checkbox"/> improving assessment processes <input type="checkbox"/> improving academic support services OR <input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed and used direct student learning outcomes assessment results to inform changes intended to improve student learning by: <input type="checkbox"/> enhancing or revising curriculum <input type="checkbox"/> developing instructional strategies or conducting professional development activities <input type="checkbox"/> improving assessment processes <input type="checkbox"/> improving academic support services AND <input type="checkbox"/> Described why changes were needed and indicated next steps or follow-up assessment OR <input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed and used direct student learning outcomes assessment results to inform changes intended to improve student learning by: <input type="checkbox"/> enhancing or revising curriculum <input type="checkbox"/> developing instructional strategies or conducting professional development activities <input type="checkbox"/> improving assessment processes <input type="checkbox"/> improving academic support services AND <input type="checkbox"/> Described why changes were needed and indicated next steps or follow-up assessment AND <input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Evidence (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear Evidence (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced (4)

Overall Comments:

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, 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.