

Annual Assessment Report Feedback Rubric

For use in drafting feedback memos on 2025-2026 annual assessment report submissions

Purpose and Use

Purpose. This rubric is intended to support consistent, constructive feedback to programs that submit the Annual Assessment Report. It can be shared with report submitters in advance so they understand how reports will be reviewed and how feedback memos will be drafted.

Use in feedback memos. Reviewers may use the rubric to identify strengths, note where additional clarification would strengthen the report, and suggest next steps that support assessment quality, student learning, and continuous improvement. The rubric is not intended to be punitive or to rank programs against one another.

- Focus feedback on clarity, completeness, usefulness of evidence, and connection between findings and action.
- Recognize that specialized accreditation reports may use different formats; review them for whether they substantially address the same information requested in the annual report.
- Use "Not Applicable" when a criterion does not apply, such as Academic Program Review items for programs without a current APR update.

Overall Rating Scale

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Needs Attention	Not Applicable
Clear, complete, evidence-based, and useful for continuous improvement. Could serve as a model example.	Adequately addresses the element with enough information to understand the process, findings, and next steps.	Partially addresses the element, but additional detail, evidence, or explanation would strengthen the report.	Does not yet provide enough information for meaningful feedback or for understanding assessment practice.	The element is not relevant to the program, report type, or current review cycle.

Core Rubric for Reviewing Annual Assessment Reports

Select the performance level that best describes the submission for each area and record concise notes that can be translated into the feedback memo.

Rubric Area	What Reviewers Look For	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Needs Attention	Feedback Memo Notes
1. Identification of Assessed PLO and Institutional Learning Outcome Alignment	The report identifies the Program Learning Outcome assessed during the cycle and explains how it connects to Sacramento State Institutional Learning Outcomes.	The PLO is clearly stated, appropriate for the degree program, and the relationship to one or more Institutional Learning Outcomes is specific and meaningful.	The PLO is identified and a reasonable connection to Institutional Learning Outcomes is described.	The PLO or ILO connection is present but vague, incomplete, or difficult to interpret.	The assessed PLO is missing or the ILO connection is not addressed.	Name the PLO reviewed. Note whether the ILO alignment is clear and suggest where specificity would help.
2. Assessment Methods and Implementation	The report describes the direct and indirect measures used, how the assessment was	Direct and indirect measures are clearly described; implementation, sample size,	Methods are understandable and include most relevant	Methods are partially described but leave questions about implementation,	Assessment methods are missing, unclear, or not	Note whether the assessment process can be understood by an external reader. Ask for missing

	implemented, and the number or scope of students assessed.	timing, courses or experiences, and scoring process are sufficiently explained.	details about implementation and students assessed.	student sample, scoring, or the distinction between direct and indirect evidence.	connected to the selected PLO.	sample, tool, rubric, or implementation details.
3. Evidence, Results, and Interpretation	The report presents assessment results and explains what the results suggest about graduating students' skills or learning.	Results are specific, evidence-based, and interpreted in relation to expected student learning; strengths and areas for growth are clearly discussed.	Results are presented and include a reasonable interpretation of student learning.	Results are summarized but lack sufficient specificity, benchmarks, disaggregation, or interpretation.	Results are missing, anecdotal only, or not clearly tied to the assessed PLO.	Highlight what the evidence shows. Suggest adding performance criteria, benchmarks, charts, or a clearer interpretation when needed.
4. Use of Results and Closing the Loop	The report explains how results have been or will be used to improve student learning, including changes from prior assessment cycles where applicable.	Actions are clearly tied to findings, feasible, and focused on student learning; prior changes and their effects are described when relevant.	The report describes appropriate planned or completed actions connected to the results.	Actions are mentioned but are broad, weakly connected to findings, or lack timeline, responsibility, or implementation detail.	The report does not describe how results will be used, or actions are not connected to assessment findings.	Identify the feedback-to-action connection. Suggest a timeline, owner, next assessment point, or evidence of impact when appropriate.
5. Program Priorities, Goals, Progress, and Challenges	The report identifies current priorities or goals for maintenance, growth, or change, including progress and challenges.	Priorities are clear, strategic, and connected to program context, student learning, enrollment, curriculum, resources, or continuous improvement.	Priorities or goals are stated with some discussion of progress or challenges.	Priorities are general or disconnected from evidence, planning, or program context.	Priorities, goals, progress, or challenges are missing.	Acknowledge program context and progress. Recommend connecting priorities to assessment evidence, resources, or planned actions.
6. Academic Program Review Update, if Applicable	For programs with APR activity, the report provides a brief update on progress and actions taken in response to the MOU; otherwise it indicates no update.	APR status, MOU-related actions, progress, and next steps are clearly summarized or a relevant supporting document is provided.	APR update is present and generally addresses progress or actions.	APR update is present but lacks sufficient detail about progress, actions, or relationship to the MOU.	APR update is missing when applicable, or it is unclear whether APR applies.	Confirm APR applicability. Suggest naming MOU items, progress made, next steps, or noting "No update at this time" when appropriate.
7. Completeness of Supporting Materials	The report includes or references supporting materials requested by the survey, such as the CSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan, Curriculum Map Matrix, specialized accreditation report, or APR detail when applicable.	Requested materials are included or clearly explained; uploaded reports identify where each annual report question is addressed.	Most relevant materials are provided or adequately referenced.	Some materials are missing or uploaded materials require clearer crosswalks to the annual report questions.	Key supporting materials are missing with no explanation.	Note any missing uploads or unclear crosswalks. Invite the program to identify where each question is addressed in accreditation materials.
8. Clarity, Accessibility, and Usefulness of Narrative	The report is understandable to a reader outside the program and provides enough context to support a constructive feedback memo.	Narrative is concise, organized, and clear; key terms, evidence, and actions can be understood without specialized insider knowledge.	Narrative is generally clear and complete with minor areas for clarification.	Narrative is difficult to follow in places or relies on unexplained acronyms, assumptions, or missing context.	Narrative is too incomplete or unclear to support meaningful review.	Use feedback memo language that asks for clarification while recognizing what is already working well.

Reviewer Worksheet for Feedback Memos

Use this worksheet to convert rubric findings into concise memo feedback. The prompts can be copied into a memo template or used as internal reviewer notes.

Area	Strengths to Acknowledge	Clarifications or Enhancements to Request	Suggested Next Step / Memo Language
PLO and ILO alignment	The report clearly identifies...	The memo could ask for...	In a future report, consider...
Methods and implementation	A strength of the report is...	Additional detail would help explain...	Please consider including the sample size, assessment tool, or scoring process...
Results and interpretation	The results provide useful evidence that...	The interpretation would be stronger with...	Consider adding benchmark information or a brief explanation of what the results suggest...

Use of results	The planned or completed action is well connected to...	The report could more clearly connect findings to...	A helpful next step may be to identify timeline, responsible parties, and how impact will be evaluated...
Program goals and priorities	The priorities described show...	More context would help readers understand...	Consider connecting priorities to assessment evidence, student learning, or program planning...
APR or supporting materials	The update/materials provided help clarify...	The submission would be strengthened by...	When applicable, identify the relevant MOU item or where each annual report question is addressed...

Optional Feedback Memo Structure

Opening: Thank the submitter and name the degree program/report reviewed. State that the feedback is intended to support ongoing assessment and continuous improvement.

Overall Strengths: Summarize two to three strengths, such as clear PLO alignment, strong direct evidence, meaningful interpretation of results, or thoughtful use of findings.

Questions or Areas for Clarification: List only the most important clarifications needed to strengthen the report. Frame them as ways to make the assessment story clearer to readers outside the program.

Suggested Next Steps: Offer feasible next steps tied to the rubric, such as adding a benchmark, clarifying sample size, identifying a timeline for changes, or assessing impact in a future cycle.

Closing: Reinforce appreciation for the program's assessment work and invite questions or consultation as appropriate.