

## AWC Academic Course Level Assessment Plan Rubric

Process/Stage Element	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
<b>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</b> Sample: Analyze cities as products of modernization, as expressions of various processes, such as investment and employment.	No SLOs defined.	SLOs identify basic knowledge and conceptual understandings, but too broad and vague to measure or not specifically identified.	SLOs are defined, more specific and less vague. Clearly identify how students will be different because of the learning experience. Potential to measure.	Anchored in verbs, clearly identifies the actions, behaviors, dispositions, and ways of thinking or knowing that students should be able to demonstrate. Well written and measurable.
<b>Measures (Methods)</b>	Methods and measures are not listed or too general (e.g., courses, exams)	One method of assessment for each SLOs is included in the plan and is linked to the SLOs.	Two or more performance assessments are identified and clearly linked to SLOs.	Multiple methods and measures of assessments across the term of the course are included as well as identifying rubrics or scoring guides.
<b>Benchmarks/Standards</b>	No benchmarks or standards/statements of intended student success indicated. Standard is not realistic.	Minimum, general, standards are set for every SLO. Standard is realistic. No specific rubric benchmark identified.	Standards are identified and appropriate for all SLOs. Rubric benchmark indicated.	Standards are identified and vary depending on the circumstances (e.g., fundamental skills vs capstone skills). Considered multiple targets as appropriate.
<b>Results/Findings</b>	No results.	Results listed. No target level achievement defined. No indication of action plan.	Results listed. Breakdown of student success levels. Target level achievement defined. No indication of action plan.	Results listed. Target level achievement defined. Indication of action plan (planned or unnecessary). If applicable, comparison of results on same measures from previous year's assessment and whether or not an improvement was achieved.
<b>Analysis</b>	No strengths/weaknesses identified. No additional analysis.	Strengths and weaknesses of assessment tools listed. No additional analysis.	Strengths and weaknesses of assessment tools listed. Additional analysis provided.	Strengths and weaknesses of assessment tools listed. Additional analysis and key indicators have been provided.
<b>Recommendations</b>	No recommendations.	Identification of improvement needed. No recommendations.	Identification of improvement needed. Recommendations.	Faculty recommendations for improvements along with supporting information of what instruction, assignments, activities will be modified to increase student learning.
<b>Actions</b>	No actions indicated.	Actions indicated. No target date, responsible party, or priority level.	Actions indicated. Target date and/or responsible party identified. No priority level.	Actions indicated. Target date, responsible party, and priority level identified.

Originally borrowed from WASC, adapted by BA Holzman, Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, SFSU, 2006. Addition/revisions by Cheryl L. Ney, Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education, Cal Poly, 2007. Additions/revisions by Anne Wahl, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Office, RIT, 2010. Adapted and revised by Elaine Groggett, Assessment, Program Review, Curriculum and Articulation Office, AWC, 2019.