

Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Program/Unit Name _____

Year _____

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Definition of Dept./Unit:

A concise statement outlining the purpose of the program, who it serves, in what ways, and with what result, including mission.

Exemplary

Acceptable

Developing

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise. • Specific to the unit (identifies what it does that separates it from other units). • Addresses the larger impact of the program. • Identifies stakeholders. • Aligned with the college and division mission and with respective professional organization, if applicable. • Aligned with the University Flight Plan: Complete Reference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of the program's purpose and who it serves. • Aligned with the college and division mission statements. • Scope and reach may be limited. • Aligned with the University Flight Plan: Partial Reference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statement of the intent of the program. • Identifies the functions performed but not the greater purpose. • Does not identify stakeholders. • Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with college or division mission. • Too general to distinguish the unit or too specific to encompass the entire mission. • Aligned with the University Flight Plan: No Reference
---	---	--

Notes:

Outcomes/Objectives

Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience; for administrative units, objectives describe the desired quality of key services.

Exemplary

Acceptable

Developing

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observable and/or measurable. • Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge for academic units (may also include general competencies); focus on the cumulative effect of the program. • Reasonable number of outcomes met. identified- enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess. • Uses action verbs. • Describe the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type (BS/BA, MS, PhD) if applicable. • Align with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable. • Accurately classified as "student learning" or "not student learning". • Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.) are identified, where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observable and/or measurable. • Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline. • Aligned with program, college, and university mission. • Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe a process, and not an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what the program does, and not what the student learns). • Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome/objective has been • Incomplete - not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program. • Outcomes/objectives identified don't seem important/aligned with the program mission. • Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.).
---	--	--

Notes

Assessment Tools/ Measures

The variety of methods used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering data.

Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple measures for some or all associated outcomes/objectives. • Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct. • Instruments reflect good research methodology. • Feasible -existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes/objectives. • Purposeful-clear how results could be used for program improvement. • Described with sufficient detail (documents attached in Document Repository, where appropriate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome/objective. • Direct and indirect measures are utilized. • Described with sufficient detail. • Implementation may still need further planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all outcomes/objectives have measures. • Few or no direct measures used. • Methodology is questionable. • Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet. • Course grades used as an assessment method. • Do not seem to capture the "end of experience" effect of the curriculum/ program.

Notes:

Rationale: Describe tools/ Achievement Targets/ Benchmarks/ Sample/ Discussion and Analysis of data

Result, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome.

Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with measures and outcomes/objectives Represent a reasonable level of success. • Specific and measurable. • Meaningful- based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with measures outcomes/objectives. • Target identified for each measure. • Specific and measurable. • Some targets may seem arbitrary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure. • Seem off-base (too low/high). • Language is vague or subjective (e.g. "Improve", "satisfactory") making it difficult to tell if met. • Aligned with assessment <i>process</i> rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed).

Notes:

General considerations

- *Is it likely that this assessment plan will yield information useful for making improvements in the student learning experience and/or the program/unit?*
- *Are internal and/or external stakeholders (may include students, customers, faculty, staff, administrators, advising boards, employers, etc.) involved in the assessment process?*
- *Is the plan feasible with current resources and staff?*
- *Is there a plan for collecting, tabulating, and analyzing assessment results? Who will be responsible for this work and when will it be done?*
- *Do all elements of the assessment plan include dates of collection?*

Results/Findings

A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.

Exemplary**Acceptable****Developing**

- Complete, concise and well-organized.
- Appropriate data collection/analysis.
- Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target.
- Provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met.
- Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate.
- Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports*, etc.) are attached.

- Complete and organized.
- Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target.
- Address whether targets were met.
- May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set.

- Incomplete or too much information.
- Not clearly aligned with achievement targets.
- Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met.
- Questionable data collection/analysis; may "gloss over" data to arrive at conclusion.

Notes:

Modifications/Actions Due to Results

Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results.

Exemplary**Acceptable****Developing**

- Action plans clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) was used to develop the plan.
- Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical "next steps."
- Contains completion dates.
- Identifies a responsible person/group.
- Number of action plans are manageable.

- Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle.
- At least one action plan in place.
- Action plans follow from assessment results.

- Not clearly related to assessment results.
- Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or "next steps" for program improvement.
- No action plans or too many to manage.
- Too general; lacking details (e.g. time frame, responsible party).

Notes:

Analysis Question for discussion (Process of Institutional Effectiveness as a whole)

Program's answer to, "What changes are you planning to make based on what you learned last year from your findings? What assessment/results did you use to determine this?"

Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates thorough analysis of findings.• Elaborates on specific findings used to make program improvements.• Makes a clear connection between finding(s) and action plan(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completed analysis question.• Identifies finding(s) used to make program improvements.• Changes/improvements made to program relate to finding(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis question incomplete, or vague or unclear response to question.• Failure to identify finding(s) used to make program improvements.

Notes:
