

Program/Unit Name _____ Year _____

Reviewer _____

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Review Rubric

Definition of Dept. or 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 & 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 & division mission & 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 & 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
---	--	--

Program Goals/Student Learning Outcomes/Unit Objectives

Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, & 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 for academic units (may also general competencies); focus on the cumulative effect of the program. -Reasonable number of outcomes 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 wirh professional organizations, where applicable. -Accurately classified as “student learning” or “not student learning”. Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.) are identified. 	<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, & university mission. -Appropriate, but language may be vague. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Describe a process, & not an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what knowledge the program does, & not what include student learns). -Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome/objective has been met. -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.)
--	---	---

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 & 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. -Describes 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 & indirect measures are utilized. -Describes 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 describes; may not be developed yet. -Course grades used as assessment method. -Do not seem to capture the “end of experience” effect of the curriculum/ program.
--	---	--

**Rationale: Describe tools/Achievement
Targets/Benchmarks/Sample/Discussion & 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 & outcomes/objectives represent a reasonable level success. -Specific & measurable. -Meaningful-based on benchmarks, results, existing standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Aligned with measures outcomes/objectives. -Target identified for each measure. -Specific & 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 process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed).
--	---	--

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, & 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

<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Complete, concise & 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Complete & 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-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.
---	--	--

Provide Evidence of Seeking Improvement Based on Analysis of Results

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

Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Action plans clearly follow from assessment results & directly state which finding(s) was used to develop plan. -Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced & logical “next steps”. -Contains completion dates. -Identifies a responsible person/group. -Number of action plans are manageable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not clearly related to assessment results. -Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or “next the steps” for program improvement. -No action plans or too many to manage. -Too general; lacking details (e.g. time defines frame, responsible party).

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"> -Elaborates on specific findings used make program improvements. -Makes a clear connection between finding(s) & 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 findings. -Failure to identify finding(s) used to make program improvements.