

Texas A&M International University

Assessment Plan Rubric

TEXAS A&M INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY Use this rubr

Use this rubric to assess the quality of assessment plan

Report Element	Levels of Performance				
	Exemplary (3)	Sufficient (2)	Developing (1)	Needs Attention (0)	
Mission Statement	□Program mission is clear, concise, and specific to the program. □Program mission directly aligns with university's mission	 Program mission is stated with some clarity and specificity. Program mission closely aligns with university's mission. 	 Program mission is vague but can still be understood. Program mission partially aligns with university's mission. 	 Program mission is absent or difficult to understand. Program mission does not align with university's mission. 	
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	 Three to five PLOs tested. PLOs are clear, concise, and measurable. PLOs identify specific content, knowledge, or skills students should obtain upon completion of a program. PLOs clearly align with program mission. PLOs specify who should be assessed (e.g., "Graduating Seniors in Biology B.A. program") (Note this is the same as sufficient) 	 Two PLOs tested. PLOs are broad, but still clear enough to infer student action and measurability. PLOs identify general content, knowledge, or skills students should obtain upon completion of a program. PLOs mostly align with program mission. PLOs specify who should be assessed (e.g., "Graduating Seniors in Biology B.A. program") (Note this is the same as sufficient) 	 □ One PLO tested. □ PLOs are vague and resulting measurement will provide incomplete data required for action. □ PLOs identify tangential content, knowledge, or skills students should obtain upon completion of a program. □ PLOs somewhat align with program mission. □ PLOS are non-specific as to who should be assessed (e.g., students) 	 PLOs are absent. PLOs are unmeasurable. PLOs do not define end result of an activity, program, or service provided by the unit. PLOs do not align with program mission. PLOs do not state who should be assessed. 	
Measures	 □ Two or more Measures (Minimum of Two Direct) specified. □ Measures are clearly described with sufficient amount of details. □ Measures directly align with corresponding PLO. Detail is provided regarding outcome-to-measure match. Specific items on the test are linked to outcomes. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts. □ Measures include a clear and adequate description of the scoring instrument. 	 □ Two measures (Minimum of One Direct) specified. □ Measures are broadly described with some amount of details. □ Measures closely align with corresponding PLO. General detail about how outcomes relate to measures Is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the outcomes, or the instrument was selected "because its general description appeared to match our outcomes." □ Measures include a mostly clear description of the scoring instrument. 	 One direct measure or two indirect measures specified. Measures are vaguely described with little amount of details. Measures partially align with corresponding PLO, but no explanation is provided. Measures include a vague description of the scoring instrument. 	 One indirect measure specified or measures are absent. Measures are not described with relevant details. Measures do not align with corresponding PLO. Measures do not include a description of the scoring instrument. 	

Total Score

	Benchmarks directly align with the	Benchmarks closely align with the	Benchmarks partially align	Benchmarks do not align with the
Benchmarks	measure and/or scoring instrument.	measure and/or scoring instrument.	with the scoring instrument.	measure and/or scoring instrument.
	Benchmarks indicate a challenging ,	Benchmarks are reasonable level	Benchmarks are realistic but	Benchmarks are absent or are not
	but realistic level of vigor.	of rigor.	lack rigor.	realistic.
	Benchmarks are specific and justified	Benchmarks specify desired	Benchmarks are stated as a	
	(e.g., Last year the typical student scored	results (e.g., our students will gain ¹ / ₂	desired results (e.g., student	
	20 points on measure x. The current	standard deviation from junior to	growth, comparison to previous	
	cohort underwent more extensive	senior year; our students will score	year's data, comparison to faculty	
	coursework in the area, so we hope that	above a faculty-determined	standards, performance vs. a	
	the average student scores 22 points or	standard).	criterion), but not specific (e.g.,	
	better).		students will grow; students will	
			perform better than last year).	