YORK College | CUNY

Academic Assessment Committee (AAC)

Program Assessment Rubric

Program Name: _____   **Academic Year:** _____

Mark one category per row and include evidence for each element referenced.

Source Document	Capacity Criteria	Initial	Emerging	Developed
Program webpage/ YAMS[1]	Program Mission	☐ Program mission fails to identify three or more elements (program name, purpose, key functions, stakeholders and alignment with the college mission)	☐ Program mission identifies program name, purpose, key functions but lack clarity of stakeholders and alignment to the college mission	☐ Program mission clearly identifies program name, purpose, key functions, stakeholders and evidence alignment with the college mission
	Program Goals	☐ Program learning goals are not aligned to the program mission and do not address knowledge, skills, and/or values	☐ Program learning goals appear to be aligned to the program mission and one or more learning domains are not addressed, i.e., knowledge, skills, and/or values	☐ Program learning goals are aligned to the program mission and are stated in broad terms of knowledge, skills, and/or values
YAMS	Curriculum Map For externally accredited programs, see the relevant accreditation documents.	☐ Not all program student learning outcomes are listed and/or only a subset of required courses are mapped to the program SLOs[2]; progress of each outcome in the curriculum (I, R, M)[3] is not identified/clear	☐ All program student learning outcomes are listed and most of the major required/elective courses are mapped to the program SLOs; progress of each outcome in the curriculum (I, R, M) is somewhat clear	☐ All program student learning outcomes are listed, and all of the major required/elective courses (regularly offered) are mapped to the program SLOs; progress of each outcome in the curriculum (I, R, M) is clearly identified

---

[1] YAMS =York Assessment Management System
[2] SLOs = Student Learning Outcomes
[3] I=Introduced, R=Reinforced, M=Mastered

September 16, 2024

Source Document	Capacity Criteria	Initial	Emerging	Developed
ANNUAL PLAN	Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) assessed	☐ Program student learning outcomes lack alignment with the program goals and are not observable, measurable and student centered	☐ Program student learning outcomes are inconsistently aligned with the program goals, and not each PSLO is observable, measurable and student centered	☐ Each program student learning outcomes is aligned with the program goals, is observable, measurable and is student centered
	Alignment with York's Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)	☐ None of the PSLOs are aligned to a York Institutional Learning Outcome	☐ Some PSLOs are aligned to a York Institutional Learning Outcome	☐ All PSLOs are aligned to a York Institutional Learning Outcome
	Alignment with MSCHE Standard III Competencies	☐ None of the PSLOs are aligned to a MSCHE Standard III Competencies	☐ Some PSLOs are aligned to a MSCHE Standard III Competencies	☐ All PSLOs are aligned to a MSCHE Standard III Competencies
	From which course(s), section(s) or other sources will you collect student artifacts?	☐ None of the plan outcomes identify courses/sections in which student artifacts will be collected	☐ Some of the plan outcomes identify courses/sections in which student artifacts will be collected	☐ All of the plan outcomes identify courses/sections in which student artifacts will be collected
	Assessment Method	☐ Has not yet developed (or identified) direct assessment measures	☐ Has developed (or identified) direct assessment measures for at least one PSLO	☐ Has developed (or identified) direct assessment measures for all PSLOs
Annual Report	Sample size	☐ Does not identify the sample size and/or courses used to collect data for any of the program student learning outcomes	☐ Has identified the sample size and courses used to collect data for at least program student learning outcome	☐ Has identified the sample size and courses used to collect data for program student learning outcomes currently being assessed. Has indicated why the sample size is appropriate and representative of the program's student population

September 16, 2024

Source Document	Capacity Criteria	Initial	Emerging	Developed
	Target[4]	☐ Target is not defined for any of the program student learning outcomes	☐ Target is defined (identifies a percentage) for at least one of the program student learning outcomes	☐ Target is defined (identifies a percentage) for the assessed program student learning outcomes
	Findings and Progress	☐ Findings are incomplete for one or more of the PSLOs assessed	☐ Findings are described but are unclear or don't tie back to the PSLOs assessed	☐ Findings are clearly described and tie back to the PSLOs assessed
	Use of Results	☐ Program did not indicate how results will be used for one or more of the PSLOs assessed	☐ Program indicated a change that does not align with the assessment findings for one or more of the PSLOs	☐ Program indicated a change that aligns with the assessment findings for all PSLOs assessed
	Recommended Change(s) and Next Steps	☐ Program does not explain the recommended change or provides an explanation of why there is no change for any PSLOs assessed Program does not yet have plans for next steps and there is no understanding on what action is needed	☐ Program provides little or no explanation of the recommended change or provides limited explanation of why there is no change for some of the PSLOs assessed Program has plans for next steps including the required action, but they are not yet clear or feasible	☐ Program explains the recommended change and/or provides an explanation of why there is no change for all PSLOs assessed Program has concrete plans for next steps with goals, roles, timelines and required actions
	Assessment Communication	☐ Program did not share findings with anyone for any PSLOs assessed	☐ Program indicated findings were shared with two or more groups for at least one or more PSLOs assessed	☐ Program indicated findings were shared with two or more groups for all PSLOs assessed
	Attachment: Rubrics ☐ Does not have a rubric ☐ *Check if N/A*	☐ Has rubric that does not evidence alignment with PGs and PSLOs and lacks criteria and descriptors that are mutually exclusive	☐ Has rubric that aligns with PGs and PSLOs, evidence scale, and has one or more criteria and descriptors that are not mutually exclusive	☐ Has rubric that aligns with PGs and PSLOs, evidence scale and includes criteria and descriptors that are mutually exclusive

---

[4] Target = the percentage of the artifacts meeting the anticipated proficiency on the rubric.

September 16, 2024

Source Document	Capacity Criteria	Initial	Emerging	Developed
	Changes Implemented: Current Status	☐ Program does not demonstrate *closing the loop*, i.e., having implemented changes as per last year's assessment action plan	☐ Program partially demonstrates *closing the loop*, i.e., implemented some changes as per last year's assessment action plan but is missing at least one of these components, e.g., time of implementation and/or when the change will be reassessed	☐ Program has demonstrated *closing the loop*, i.e., implemented all changes as per last year's assessment action plan and identifies the time of implementation including when the change will be reassessed

Source Documents: _____

For externally-accredited programs, see the relevant accreditation documents.

Consider for Assessment Spotlight *(OIESP summarizes and writes about the assessment activity and shares it College-wide)*? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Program Assessment Summary Sheet: ☐ Attached   ☐ Not attached

Comments/Recommendations:

_____

_____

_____

Completed by: Working Group Leader and Members: _____ Date_____

Academic Assessment Committee Chair: _____Date_____

Date Feedback sent to Department Coordinator and Chair:_____

Please contact AAC Chair for further discussion/questions.

September 16, 2024