Institutional Effectiveness Report Review Rubric

	Developing	Acceptable	Exemplary
Definition of Dept. or Unit	1. Statement is too general to distinguish the unit or too specific to encompass the entire mission. 2. Scope and reach may be limited or missing. 3. Does not identify stakeholders. 4. Does not align with university mission. 5. No Curriculum Mapping provided.	1. Identifies the program's purpose and functions. 2. Scope and reach may be limited. 3. Partially identifies stakeholders. 4. Partially aligned with university mission statements. 5. Provides Curriculum Mapping or is in development.	1. Clear and concise statement that articulates the specific functions of the program and differentiates itself from other units. 2. Addresses the larger impact of the program. 3. Identifies stakeholders. 4. Clearly aligned with university mission. 5. Provides Curriculum Mapping.
Program Goals/ Student Learning Outcomes	1. Too few outcomes to adequately encompass the mission or too many outcomes to be manageable. 2. Describes a process not an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what knowledge the program covers and not what the student learns). 3. Incomplete: not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program. 4. Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome/objective has been met. 5. Outcomes/objectives identified don't seem important/aligned with the program mission.	1. Reasonable number of outcomes identified with enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess. 2. Observable and/or measurable, but language may be vague. 3. Encompasses the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline. 4. Describes level of mastery expected. 5. Aligned with college and university mission/ goals.	1. Reasonable number of outcomes identified with enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess. 2. Observable and/or measurable. 3. Encompasses a discipline-specific body for academic units (may also include general competencies); focuses on the cumulative effect of the program. 4. Describes the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type (BS/BA, MS, PhD) if applicable. 5. Aligns with college and university mission/ goals and with professional organizations, where applicable.
Assessment Tools/ Measures	1. Not all outcomes/objectives have measures. 2. Few or no direct measures used. 3. Instruments are vaguely described, may not be developed yet, or course grades used as assessment method. 4. No performance criteria/level discussed. 5. Does not describe how results will be used for program improvement. 6. Little to no supporting documentation and/ or documentation is not relevant.	1. At least 1 measure or measurement identified for each outcome/ objective. 2. Direct & indirect measures are utilized. 3. Feasible: existing practices used where possible. 4. Performance criteria/level may need more detail. 5. Describes how results will be used for program improvement. 6. Provides some supporting documentation, such as rubrics, surveys, etc.	1. Multiple measures for some or all associated outcomes/ objectives. 2. Direct & indirect measures used; emphasis on direct. 3. Feasible: existing practices used where possible; some measures apply to multiple outcomes/objectives. 4. Performance criteria/level described in detail. 5. Purposeful: clear how results could be used for program improvement. 6. Provides supporting documentation such as rubrics, surveys, etc.

Institutional Effectiveness Report Review Rubric

	Developing	Acceptable	Exemplary
Assessment Rationale	1. Assessments lack alignment with outcomes/ objectives. May focus on the assessment process rather than results. 2. Language is vague or subjective (e.g. "Improve", "Satisfactory"). 3. Targets have not been identified for every measure or are not aligned with the measure. 4. Does not describe how results will be used for program improvement.	1. Assessments aligned with outcomes/objectives. 2. Specific & measurable. 3. Targets identified for each measure though some targets may seem arbitrary. 4. Describes how results will be used for program improvement.	1. Assessments clearly aligned with outcomes/objectives. 2. Specific & measurable. 3. Meaningful: based on benchmarks, results, existing standards. 4. Purposeful: clear how results could be used for program improvement. 5. Disseminated and discussed with program constituents.
Results/ Findings	1. Incomplete results or includes results not previously referenced. 2. Questionable data collection/analysis; may "gloss over" data to arrive at conclusion. 3. Not clearly aligned with achievement targets. 4. Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met. 5. No comparison to past trends or benchmarks. 6. Little or no supporting documentation and/ or documentation not relevant.	1. Complete and organized results for some of the assessments. 2. Followed appropriate data collection/analysis methods. 3. Aligns with the language of the corresponding achievement target. 4. Addresses whether targets were met. 5. May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set. 6. Provides some supporting documentation.	1. Complete, concise, & well-organized results for a majority of assessments. 2. Followed appropriate data collection/ analysis methods. 3. Aligns with the language of the corresponding achievement target. 4. Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met. 5. Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate. 6. Provides supporting documentation.
Analysis of Results & Mods for Improvement	1. No action plans or too many action plans to manage. 2. Action plan not clearly related to assessment results. 3. Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or "next steps" for seeking program improvement. 4. Actions are too general, lacking details. 5. Does not identify responsible person/ group. 6. Makes no connection with Strategic Plan Priority Actions.	1. Number of action plans are manageable. 2. Action plan reflects with sufficient depth what was learned during the assessment cycle and follows from assessment results. 3. Identifies at least one action plan for seeking program improvement. 4. Identifies actions for seeking improvement. 5. May identify a responsible person/group. 6. Makes some connection with Strategic Plan Priority Actions.	1. Number of action plans are manageable. 2. Action plans clearly state use of assessment results & directly identify which finding(s) was used to develop plan. 3. Identifies an area of need to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced. 4. Contains specific actions for seeking improvement. 5. Identifies a responsible person/group. 6. Makes clear connection with Strategic Plan Priority Actions.
Process of Institutional Effectiveness	1. Measurable student learning outcomes are identified. 2. Additions or quality improvements needed for outcomes, assessments, and/or modifications for improvement.	1. Appropriate IE components, but report language may be vague or need revision. 2. Adjustments to student learning outcomes, assessment tools, and/or modifications for improvement are recommended.	1. Measurable student learning outcomes, comprehensive assessment tools, and processes for analysis and discussion of data are identified. 2. Assessment results are used to continually monitor progress and make changes.