

## EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE OF ACADEMIC QUALITY

*Items in **boldface** are particularly suitable for assessing student learning within a course.*

### Direct Evidence of What Students Are Learning

- Ratings by cooperative education/internship supervisors of student skills
- Employer ratings of satisfaction with the program and employee skills
- Pass rates on appropriate licensure/certification exams (e.g., Praxis, NLN) or exit exams (e.g., MFATs, Test of Critical Thinking Ability) that assess key learning outcomes
- “Blind” or externally-scored rubric (rating scale) scores on “capstone” projects such as research papers, class presentations, exhibitions, or performances
- **Portfolios of student work**
- **Rubric (rating scale) scores for written work, oral presentations, or performances**
- **Scores on locally-designed multiple choice and/or essay tests, accompanied by test “blueprints” describing what the test assesses**
- **Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples**
- **Electronic discussion threads**
- **Student reflections on what they have learned over the course of the program**
- **Student reflections on their values, attitudes and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the course or program**
- Student publications and conference presentations

### Indirect Evidence of Student Learning (Signs that Students Are Probably Learning, But Exactly What They Are Learning is Less Clear)

- Graduate program admission rate
- Graduate program success (completion) rate
- Quality/reputation of graduate and professional programs into which students are accepted
- Placement into career positions
- Honors, awards, and scholarships awarded to students and graduates
- Transcript analyses
- List of the major learning outcomes of the program, distributed to all students in the program
- Percent of courses whose **syllabi include a list of the major learning outcomes of the course**
- Percent of courses whose **syllabi state learning outcomes that include thinking skills** (not just simple understanding of facts and principles)

- **Average proportion of final grade based on assessments of thinking skills**
- **Ratio of paper-and-pencil tests to performance assessments**
- **Test “blueprints” (outlines of the concepts and skills covered on tests)**
- **Documentation of the match between course/program objectives and assessments**
- Percent of freshman-level classes taught by full professors
- Number or percent of **courses with service learning opportunities**
- Number or percent of **courses with collaborative learning opportunities**
- Number or percent of **courses taught using culturally-responsive teaching techniques**
- **Percent of class time spent in active learning**
- Number of student hours spent in community service activities
- Percent of student majors participating in relevant co-curricular activities (e.g., club in discipline)
- **Voluntary attendance at intellectual/cultural events germane to the course or program**

### Insights into *Why* Students Are or Aren’t Learning

- Length of time to degree
- Student/alumni satisfaction, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
- **Student feedback via Angelo & Cross’s Classroom Assessment Techniques**
- Course portfolios
- Library holdings in the program’s discipline(s)
- Expenditures for faculty professional development
- Department-sponsored opportunities for faculty professional development
- Number and/or dollar value of grants awarded to faculty whose purpose is improved student learning

### Evidence of Other Aspects of Academic Quality

- Specialized accreditation
- Retention and graduation rates
- Percent of students in the program who are students of color
- Percent of faculty in the program who are faculty of color
- Cost and cost-effectiveness of the program (e.g., budget, student/faculty ratios, average class size)
- Number and/or dollar value of grants awarded to faculty
- Number and/or dollar value of gifts to the department

*From a workshop presented by Linda Suskie at Temple University 2003*

## **Examples of Assignments**

### **Beyond Essays, Term Papers, and Research Reports**

Abstract or executive summary  
Advertisement or commercial  
Annotated bibliography  
Autobiography or realistic fictional diary from a historical period  
Briefing paper  
Brochure or pamphlet  
Campaign speech  
Case study/analysis  
Client report  
Collaborative group activity  
Database  
Debate or discussion (plan, participation, and/or leadership)  
Debriefing interview preparation  
Dramatization of an event or scenario, in writing or a presentation  
Editing and revision of a poorly written paper  
Evaluation of opposing points of view or the pros and cons of alternative solutions to a problem  
Experiment or other laboratory experience  
Field notes  
Game invention  
Graph, chart, diagram, flowchart, or other visual aid  
Graphic organizer, taxonomy, or classification scheme  
Handbook or instructional manual  
Journal or log (see Chapter 9)  
Letter to an editor or business  
Model, simulation, or illustration  
Narrative  
Newspaper story or news report on a concept or from a historical period  
Oral history recording of an event  
Plan to research and solve a problem  
Plan to conduct a project or provide a service  
Portfolio (Chapter 10)  
Poster, display, or exhibit  
Presentation, demonstration, or slide show  
Process description  
Proposal for and justification of a solution to a problem  
Reflection on what and how one has learned (Chapter 12)  
Review and critique of one's own work, that of a peer, a performance, an exhibit, a work of art, a writer's arguments, or how something could have been done better  
Selected portions of an essay or term paper (e.g., only the problem statement and the review of literature)  
Survey, including and analysis of the results  
Teaching a concept to a peer or a child  
Video or audio recording  
Web site

### A Rating Scale Rubric for an Information Literacy Assignment

Please indicate the student's skill in each of the following respects, as evidenced by this assignment, by checking the appropriate box. If this assignment is not intended to elicit a particular skill, please check the "N/A" box.

	Outstanding (A)	Very Good (B)	Adequate (C)	Marginally Adequate (D)	Inadequate (F)	N/A
1. Identify, locate, and access sources of information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Critically evaluate information, including its legitimacy, validity, and appropriateness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Organize information to present a sound central idea supported by relevant material in a logical order.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Use information to answer questions and/or solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Clearly articulate information and ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Use information technologies to communicate, manage, and process information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Use information technologies to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Use the work of others accurately and ethically.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. What grade are you awarding this assignment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. If you had to assign a final course grade for this student today, what would it be?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Office of Assessment, Towson University

### A Rating Scale Rubric for an Oral Presentation

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>The presenter...</b>				
Clearly stated the purpose of the presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was well organized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was knowledgeable about the subject.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Answered questions authoritatively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spoke clearly and loudly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintained eye contact with the audience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appeared confident.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adhered to time constraints.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had main points that were appropriate to the central topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accomplished the stated objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Adapted with permission from a rubric used by the Department of Health Science, Towson University

## An Example of a Rubric for a Research Paper

	<b>Novice</b>	<b>Intermediate</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Distinguished</b>
Voice and tone	Limited awareness of audience	An attempt to communicate with the audience	Evidence of voice and/or suitable tone	Evidence of distinguished voice and/or appropriate tone
Purpose	Limited awareness of purpose	An attempt to establish and maintain purpose	Focused on a purpose	Establishes and maintains clear focus
Development of ideas	Minimal idea development, limited and/or unrelated details	Unelaborated idea development; unelaborated and/or repetitious details	Deep idea development supported by elaborated, relevant details	Deep and complex ideas supported by rich, engaging, and pertinent details; evidence of analysis, reflection and insight
References	Few references	Some references	Use of references indicates ample research	Use of references indicates substantial research
Organization	Random or weak organization	Lapses in focus and/or coherence	Logical organization	Careful and/or suitable organization
Wording and sentence structure	Incorrect and/or ineffective wording and/or sentence structure	Simplistic and/or awkward sentence structure	Controlled and varied sentence structure	Variety of sentence structure and length
Language	Incorrect or lack of topic and/or transition sentences	Simplistic and/or imprecise language	Acceptable, effective language	Precise and/or rich language
Grammar and format	Errors in grammar and format (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, headings)	Some errors in grammar and/or format that do not interfere with communication	Few errors in grammar or format relative to length and complexity	Control of surface features

Adapted from: <http://www.edheritage.org/tools/rubricess.htm>  
1/28/2008

## A Descriptive Rubric for Research Reports in Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology

Introduction (10 points)	The introduction smoothly pulls the reader into the topic, is organized, presents the main argument clearly, and states the author's views. (10)	The introduction is organized but does not adequately present the main argument or does not state the author's views. (8)	The introduction presents the main argument and the author's views but is disorganized and does not flow smoothly. (7)	The introduction is disorganized and difficult to follow. The main argument and the author's views are not introduced. (5)
Content (20 points)	Information is presented clearly, completely and accurately across all sections. At least 3 major sections; at least 1 major section has 2-3 subsections. (20)	Information is unclear and difficult to understand in 1 section. (18)	Information is unclear and difficult to understand in 2-3 sections. (16)	The paper is unclear and difficult to understand across 4 or more sections. (12)
Organization (20 points)	Organization is clear; good framework. Headers, preview paragraphs, topic sentences, and transitions aid in understanding main points. Information is presented logically. (20)	Organization is unclear in 1 section (unfocused paragraphs, poor topic sentences, poor transitions). All other sections are logically organized. (18)	Organization is unclear in 2-3 sections OR headers and preview paragraphs or sentences are missing. (16)	Organization is unclear in 4 or more sections. (12)
Conclusion/ Original Thought (20 points)	Specific ideas for improving research or other ideas are presented in an organized manner with logical rationales. (20)	Specific ideas are presented but the rationales for 1 idea may be weak. (18)	Ideas are presented but in a vague, generic format OR rationales for 2 or more ideas are weak. (16)	Fewer than 3 original ideas related to the topic are presented OR all ideas are not well explained. (12)
Writing Style (10 points)	Tone is professional, vocabulary and syntax are mature, and easy to understand terms are used throughout the paper (10)	Syntax or vocabulary is complex, awkward, or filled with jargon in 1-2 sections of the paper OR words are used incorrectly in 1-2 sections of the paper. (7)	Syntax or vocabulary is complex, awkward, or filled with jargon in 3-4 sections of the paper OR words are used incorrectly in 3-4 sections of the paper. (5)	Writing style makes more than 4 sections of the paper difficult to read and understand. (3)
Writing Use/ Mechanics (10 points)	The paper is free of spelling, syntax, formatting, punctuation errors. (10)	The paper has less than 5 spelling, punctuation, formatting, syntax errors. (7)	The paper has 6-15 spelling, punctuation, formatting, syntax errors. (5)	More than 16 errors across the paper make it difficult to follow. (3)
APA Rules (10 points)	All APA rules are followed for citations, headers, numbers, series, quotes, references, etc. (10)	Fewer than 3 violations of APA rules, or 1-2 missing or incorrect citations and references (7)	4-10 violations of APA rules and/or 3-5 missing or incorrect citations and references (5)	11 or more violations of APA rules and/or 6 or more missing or incorrect citations and references. (3)

Adapted with permission from a rubric used by the Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders, Towson University.

**A Descriptive Rubric  
for a Slide Presentation on Findings from Research Sources**

	Well Done (5)	Satisfactory (4-3)	Needs Improvement (2-1)	Incomplete (0)
Organization	Clearly, concisely written. Logical, intuitive progression of ideas & supporting information. Clear & direct cues to all information.	Logical progression of ideas & supporting information. Most cues to information are clear and direct.	Vague in conveying viewpoint and purpose. Some logical progression of ideas & supporting information, but cues are confusing or flawed.	Lacks a clear point of view and logical sequence of information. Cues to information are not evident.
Persuasiveness	Motivating questions & advance organizers convey main idea. Information is accurate.	Includes persuasive information.	Includes persuasive information with few facts.	Information is incomplete, out of date, and/or incorrect.
Introduction	Presents overall topic. Draws in audience with compelling questions or by relating to audience's interests or goals.	Clear, coherent, and related to topic.	Some structure but does not create a sense of what follows. May be overly detailed or incomplete. Somewhat appealing.	Does not orient audience to what will follow.
Clarity	Readable, well-sized fonts. Italics, boldface, and indentations enhance readability. Text is appropriate length. Background and colors enhance readability.	Sometimes fonts are readable, but in a few places fonts, italics, boldface, long paragraphs, color, or background detract.	Overall readability is difficult with lengthy paragraphs, too many fonts, dark or busy background, overuse of boldface, or lack of appropriate indentations.	Text is very difficult to read. Long blocks of text, small fonts, inappropriate colors, or poor use of headings, indentations, or boldface.
Layout	Aesthetically pleasing. Contributes to message with appropriate use of headings and white space.	Uses white space appropriately.	Shows some structure but is cluttered, busy or distracting.	Cluttered and confusing. Spacing and headings do not enhance readability.

Adapted with permission from a rubric developed by Patricia Ryan, Lecturer, Department of Reading, Special Education, and Instructional Technology, Towson University

Goal → opportunities to meet goals  
define competence or knowledge  
Assessment of relative success  
self-assessments?

## Verbs

Using results + improving performance

Learning goals: what I want them to learn, outcome

Define "appreciate"

Rubric for papers

key texts in canon

analysis - application of  
of passage or to lit. devices