Rubric for Evaluating Program/Department IE Reports
Francis Marion University
2020-2021 Academic Year

Evaluation Component	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Inadequate (1)	Not Evident (0)	Row Total
Organization of report	100% of report sections (9) were included. Report was in proper order.	At least 75% of report sections (7) were included. Report sections included were in the proper order.	At least 50% of report sections (5) were included. Report sections included were not in the proper order.	At least 25% of report sections (3) were included. Report sections included were not in the proper order.	Two or fewer sections were included.	
Desired Outcomes (PLO Goals)	At least four **PLOs** are identified. 100% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.	At least four **PLOs** are identified. 75% of the PLOs are aligned with Missions Statement.	At least three **PLOs** are identified. 75-100% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.	At least three **PLOs** are identified. Less than 50% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.	No **PLOs** are identified.	
Desired Student Learning Outcomes (SLO Goals)	At least four SLOs are identified. 100% of the **SLOs** are quantifiable and aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.	At least four SLOs are identified. 75% of **SLOs** are quantifiable and aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.	At least three SLOs are identified. 50% of **SLOs** are quantifiable and aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.	At least two SLOs are identified. 25% of **SLOs** are quantifiable and aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.	No SLOs are identified. No evidence that the standard of performance is quantified for each stated goal.	
Assessment Methods & Procedures	Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section. Explain the **methods and the procedures** that were used to assess each outcome.	Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section. Explained the **methods and the procedures** that were used to assess each outcome.	Restated some of the numbered student learning outcome from previous section. Explained some of the **methods and the procedures** that were used to assess each outcome but not clear.	Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated. Did not explain the **methods and the procedures** that were used to assess each outcome.	Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated. No coverage of **methods and the procedures** were not evident.	

Assessment Methods & Procedures Continues…	**Direct and indirect** measures were utilized.	**Direct and indirect** measures were utilized.	**Direct and indirect** were utilized but no evidence of indirect measures	**Indirect measures** were utilized but no evidence of direct measures.	No evidence of **direct or indirect** measures utilized.	
	100% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple-methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)	At least 75% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)	At least 50% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)	At least 25% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)	No evidence that the assessments methods evaluate a desired outcome.	
	100% of **Baselines** (Past) are stated and quantified based on previous academic year(s).	75% of **Baselines** (Past) are stated and quantified based on previous academic year(s).	50% of **Baselines** (Past) are stated and quantified based on previous academic year(s).	25% of **Baselines** (Past) are stated and quantified based on previous academic year(s).	0% of **Baselines** (Past) are stated and quantified based on previous academic year(s).	
	100% of **Benchmarks** (Present) are related to data from prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.	75% of **Benchmarks** (Present) are related to data from prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.	50% of **Benchmarks** (Present) are related to data from prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.	25% of **Benchmarks** (Present) are related to data from prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.	0% of **Benchmarks** (Present) are related to data from prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.	
	100% of **Targets** (Future) are stated and quantified. Targets are realistic based on future improvements needed or proposed.	75% of **Targets** (Future) are stated and quantified. Targets are realistic based on future improvements needed or proposed.	50% of **Targets** (Future) are stated and quantified. Targets are realistic based on future improvements needed or proposed.	25% of **Targets** (Future) are stated and quantified. Targets are realistic based on future improvements needed or proposed.	0% of **Targets** (Future) are stated and quantified. Targets are realistic based on future improvements needed or proposed.	
Results	Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.	Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.	Restated some of the numbered student learning outcome from previous section.	Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated	Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated	
	100% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods	75% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods	50% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods	25% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.	0% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.	
	Results are presented for 100% of the assessment methods.	Results are presented for 75% of the assessment methods.	Results are presented for 50% of the assessment methods.	Results are presented for 25% of the assessment.	Results are presented for 0% of the assessment.	

Planned Improvements based on assessment results (Closing the loop and planning for the next cycle)	Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section. 100% of the actions are directly linked to stated results. 100% of the actions linked to specific student learning outcomes.	Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section. 75% of the actions are directly linked to stated results. 75% of the actions linked to specific student learning outcomes.	Restated some of the numbered student learning outcome from previous section. 50% of the actions are directly linked to stated results. 50% of the actions linked to specific student learning outcomes.	Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated. 25% of the actions are directly linked to stated results. 25% of the actions linked to specific student learning outcomes.	Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated. 0% of the actions are directly linked to stated results. 0% of the actions linked to specific student learning outcomes.	
Appendix	Provide at least 1 supporting document for the report. 100% Complete, Appropriate and Clear.	Provide at least 1 supporting document for the report. 75% Complete, Appropriate and Clear.	Provide at least 1 supporting document for the report. 50% Complete, Appropriate and Clear.	Provide at least 1 supporting document for the report. 25% Complete, Appropriate and Clear.	No supporting document for the report	
Readability of report	Report was written for a broad audience and contained no jargon. Report was concise and did not contain unnecessary information. 100% of the section headings and transitions were clear. All tables were appropriate and supported the text.	Report was written for a broad audience and contained little jargon. Report was concise but contained unnecessary information. 75% of the section headings and transitions were clear. 75% of tables were appropriate and supported the text.	The report was technical and not written for a broad audience and contained too much jargon. Report was overly verbose. 50% of section headings and transitions were clear. 50% of tables were appropriate and supported the text.	The report was far too technical and not written for a broad audience and contained far too much jargon. Report very verbose. 25% of section headings and transitions were clear. 25% of tables were appropriate and supported the text.	The report was poorly organized. The report was unreadable. 0% of section headings and transitions were clear. 0% of tables were appropriate and supported the text.	
Score						