

UNIT EFFECTIVENESS PROCESS BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY REPORT RUBRIC

I. Student Competencies/Core Functions

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|---|---|---|--|-------|
| Student Competencies/Core Functions are not stated. | Student Competencies are stated, but appear to inadequately identify broad knowledge, skills, attitudes, or behaviors that program majors should be able to demonstrate upon completion of the degree program. Core Functions are stated, but appear to inadequately identify the major responsibilities of the unit. | Student Competencies/Core Functions appear to adequately identify what they should. Further, those stated for graduate level academic programs are progressively more advanced based on degree programs gradations and they identify expectations for students with regard to knowledge of the literature for the discipline. | Student Competencies/Core Functions appear to adequately identify what they should. Further, those stated for graduate level academic programs are progressively more advanced based on degree programs gradations and they identify expectations for students with regard to knowledge of the literature for the discipline. Plus, these statements are broader than the outcome statements identified on the plan. | |

II. Intended Outcome Statements

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|--------------------------|---|-----------|---|-------|
| A. Quantity | | | | |
| Outcomes are not stated. | Too few outcomes stated (five to eight outcomes expected) and/or unacceptable in one or more of these applicable aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not contain at least one outcome related to a) research, b) service, and c) development, • Does not contain at least one outcome related to advising. | | Five to eight outcomes stated and, if applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one outcome related to a) research, b) service, and c) development, • At least one outcome related to advising. | |

| B. Clarity and Specificity | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| No outcomes are stated. | Outcomes contain imprecise verbs (e.g. know, understand), vague description of content/skill/attitude/level of quality and non-specificity of whom should be assessed. Many or most statements may also be extremely broad and may contain multiple outcomes within a single statement (i.e. compound outcomes). | Outcomes generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/attitude/level of quality and specification of whom should be assessed. Few of the statements are broad and contain multiple outcomes within a single statement (i.e. compound outcomes). | All outcomes stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/attitude/level of quality and specification of whom should be assessed. | |
| C. Orientation | | | | |
| None of the learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms or all of the administrative outcomes are termed as process statements. | Few of the learning outcomes stated are in student-center terms or most of the administrative outcomes are termed as process statements | Most of the learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms or few of the administrative outcomes are termed as process statements | All of the learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms or none of the administrative outcomes are termed as process statements | |

III. Intended Outcomes Mapped to Student Competencies/Core Functions and Planning Priorities

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| Outcomes are not mapped to Student Competencies/Core Functions and, if applicable, Planning Priorities. | Some or all of the outcomes are mapped to a Student Competency/Core Function/Planning Priority, but the relationship appears to be mismatched for all or most outcomes. | Most or all of the outcomes are mapped to an appropriately matched Student Competency/Core Function/Planning Priority. Some or all of the outcomes may be mapped to multiple Competencies, Functions or Priorities. | All of the outcomes are mapped to an appropriately matched Student Competency/Core Function/Planning Priority. Each outcome is mapped to only one Competency, Function or Priority. | |

IV. Action Steps

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|-------|
| Action steps are not stated. | Action steps are stated for each outcome, but one or more do not relate to accomplishing the intended outcomes. | Action steps are stated for each that relate to accomplishing the intended outcomes, but it unclear if they can be implemented within the time constraints of the assessment cycle and without approval from administrative bodies outside the unit. | Action steps are stated for each that relate to accomplishing the intended outcomes and it is clear they can be implemented within the time constraints of the assessment cycle and without approval from administrative bodies outside the unit. | |

V. Methodology and Criterion for Success

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|---|---|---|--|-------|
| A. Relationship between Measures and Outcome | | | | |
| No relationship between outcomes and measures. | At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the measures matches the outcomes, but no explanation is provided. | The content assessed by the measures matches the outcomes, general detail about the relationship may exist, but no explanation is provided. | The content assessed by the measures matches the outcomes and detail explanation about the outcome-to-measure match is provided. | |
| B. Types of Measures | | | | |
| No measures are indicated. | Most or all of the measures of the learning outcomes are indirect measures (e.g. surveys or other self-report indicators). | Most learning outcomes are measured through direct measures. If indirect measures are used, there are multiple measures employed. | All learning outcomes are measured using at least one direct measure. Multiple measures are used for most of the outcomes. | |
| C. Specification of Desired Results for Objectives | | | | |
| No a priori desired result is specified for the outcomes. | Statement of desired results is provided, but no specificity (e.g. students will perform better than last year). | Desired result specified (e.g. 80% of students will score 3 or higher). | Desired results specified and justification is provided (e.g. last year the typical student score 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better). | |

D. Data Collection and Research Design Integrity

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| No information is provided about data collection process. | Limited information is provided about what data will be collected; from what sources; during what approximate timeframe by whom. The limited information makes it difficult to determine the veracity of the proposed measure. | Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as a description of the sample, testing protocol, testing conditions and, if applicable, student motivation. Few, if any, mismatches with specification of desired results. | The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results. | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

VI. Results of Assessment and Proposed Improvements

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| A. Presentation of Results | | | | |
| No results presented. | Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the desired results for the outcomes. | Results are present and they directly relate to the outcomes and the desired results for the outcomes, but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. | Results are present and they directly relate to outcomes and the desired results for the outcome. The presentation is clear and easy to follow. | |
| B. Interpretation of the Results | | | | |
| No interpretation attempted. | Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the outcomes or desired results of outcomes. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or results. | Interpretations of the results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired results of the outcomes, and methodology. | Interpretations of the results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired results of the outcomes, and methodology. Plus there is evidence multiple faculty/staff participated in the interpretive process. Further, interpretation includes an explanation of any confounding factors effecting results. | |

VII. Proposed Improvements

| Undeveloped 1 | Developing 2 | Good 3 | Exemplary 4 | Score |
|---|--|--|---|-------|
| No mention of any proposed improvements even though one or more of the outcomes was not achieved or partially achieved. | Improvements are proposed for outcomes that were not achieved or partially achieved, but the link between them and the assessment findings is not clear. | Improvements are proposed and directly relate to assessment findings; however, the proposed improvements lack specificity. | Improvements are proposed and directly related to assessment findings. The proposed improvements are very specific (i.e. includes approximate date of implementation and resources needed). | |

Adapted from Fulcher, Sundre, and Russell(2010) *Assessment Progress Template (APT) Evaluation Rubric, Version 3.0*, James Madison University, The Center for Assessment and Research.