

Administrative Unit Assessment Evaluation Rubric v1.0
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College

Highlighted Elements Not Expected in Reports Until 2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

I. Mission/Goals/Outcomes

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
A. Mission Statement Present				
No mission statement provided	A statement is provided, but it does not include information about the intended role and services of the department/office.	Mission statement includes information about the role and services of the department/office, but no connection can be made to the institutional mission	Mission statement includes information about the role and services of the department/office, identifies stakeholders, and demonstrates clear alignment with and/or expansion of institutional mission	
B. Clarity of Departmental Goals				
Department goals are absent	Department goals present, but statements don't identify stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, staff, community) or departmental functions (e.g., provide technical support).	Department goals are present, clearly identify the stakeholder and departmental functions. Only some goals have specific outcomes linked to them.	All department goals identify the stakeholder and the function that serves them. All goals have measurable outcomes linked to them.	
C. Departmental Goals Linked to Institutional Goals				
Department goals absent	Department goals are listed, but there is no link to institutional goals	Some department goals linked to institutional goals	All department goals are linked to at least one institutional goal.	
D. Clarity and Specificity of Outcomes				
No outcomes stated.	Outcomes present, but with imprecise verbs (e.g., know, understand, provide), vague description of content. The outcome lacks specificity regarding level of success and does not appear to be realistic, attainable, or timely.	Outcomes generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the content, and the target of the outcome is specified and measurable. Generally specific, but it may be difficult to determine the extent to which the outcome is realistic, attainable, or timely.	All outcomes are clearly stated in measurable terms. Expectations for achievement are reasonable and targets appear to be attainable given the scope of the statement. Outcomes are specific enough to determine the extent to which they are realistic, attainable, and timely.	

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

II. Systematic method for evaluating progress on outcomes

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
A. Relationship between measures/Performance Indicators (PI) and outcomes				
Seemingly no relationship between outcomes and measures or no measures/PI indicated for a majority of outcomes.	Measures/PI are linked to stated outcomes, but no explanation of how the measures were developed to explicitly assess the outcome is provided. The measures/PI do not seem to be an appropriate format for the stated outcome. All outcomes may or may not be linked to specific measures/PI. Not enough information is provided about the measure/PI to determine the appropriateness of its relationship to the outcome.	General detail about how outcomes relate to measures is provided. For example, the survey items were written to measure satisfaction of graduating students. Any performance indicators appear to be reasonable given the stated outcome, though the degree to which the PI can be used to identify changes may be questionable (using overall retention rates to evaluate the effectiveness of a single program)	Information is provided aligning the measure with the outcome. The measure/PI is an appropriate method for assessing the stated outcome and provides information that can be useful in identifying changes (using the retention rates of a specific group to determine effectiveness of a program that targets group in question).	
B. Types of Measures				
No measures/PI indicated for a majority of outcomes.	Most outcomes assessed primarily via indirect (e.g., self-reported data) measures.	Most outcomes assessed primarily via direct measures (e.g., retention rates, satisfaction surveys, usage data)	All outcomes assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., PI, surveys (if appropriate for outcome), rubrics).	
C. Specification of Targets for Success				
No benchmarks/targets for success identified for outcomes	Statement of desired result (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year's data), but no specificity (e.g., students will grow; attendance will increase)	Desired result specified. (e.g., attendance will increase by 5%; 90% of students will state satisfaction with program). "Gathering baseline data" is acceptable for this rating.	Desired result specified and justified (e.g., last year fall to spring retention rate for UDP students was 55%. The current cohort underwent extensive one on one advising, so we hope that the fall to spring retention rate improves by 2%)	

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
D. Data collection & Research design integrity				
No information is provided about data collection process, or data are not collected.	When measures are used, limited information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five students took the survey). Or, information is provided, but the process presents several major issues that jeopardize the validity of the findings (used graduate survey data to determine success of all students).	When measures are used, the data collection process is well documented with information such as a description of the sample, survey protocol and conditions, and motivation. Nevertheless, some methodological issues that could potentially weaken the validity of the findings (small sample, unstandardized testing conditions, poor or no reliability information). Or, all assessment tools are performance indicators that require no data collection procedures.	When a measure is used, the data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, standardized testing conditions, population assessed at appropriate time in the program/intervention)	

III. Presence of Results

A. Presentation of Results/Findings				
No results presented	Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the desired results for the outcomes. Or, only results presented are general statements about performance (e.g., survey was administered, project was completed).	Results are present, and they directly relate to the outcomes and the desired results for outcomes but presentation is difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present. If applicable, results are not disaggregated by appropriate groups (men/women, first year/returning students, etc.)	Results are present, disaggregated by groups (if applicable), and they directly relate to outcomes, the desired results for outcomes, are clearly presented (e.g., tables or graphs), and any statistical analyses seem appropriate (t-tests, means or percentages provided).	
B. History of results				
No results presented	Only current year's results provided.	Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year's) provided for some assessments in addition to current year's.	Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year's) provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year's.	
C. Interpretation of 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	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. A statement is made regarding whether or not the results indicate that	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. And, interpretation includes how services/programs might have affected	

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

	methodology and/or results.	students are meeting the outcome, but no reference is made to an action plan, or to the effects of an action plan on student learning. If results are disaggregated by groups, little to no comparison of these results is made.	results. Results were shared with other staff in the department or with stakeholders. If results are disaggregated by groups, results are compared and inferences are made about any differences between groups.	
--	-----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

IV. Evidence of Improvements Based on Assessment Results

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
A. Improvement of programs regarding student learning and development				
No mention of any improvements to the department or specific programs/services.	Examples of improvements or plans for improvement documented in an action plan but the link between them, the assessment findings, and specific outcomes is absent or unclear.	Examples of improvements (or plans to improve) are described and/or documented in an action plan and directly relate to findings of assessment and outcomes. However, the improvements lack specificity.	Examples of improvements (or plans to improve) described and/or documented in an action plan and directly related to findings of assessment and outcomes. These improvements are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation, specifics of the improvements, budget or resources requested (if needed)).	
B. Improvement of assessment process.**				
No mention of how this iteration of assessment is improved from past administrations.	Some critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws (e.g., low survey response needs to be addressed), but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; Plus evidence of some moderate revision, or general plans for improvement of assessment process (e.g., low survey response will be addressed by sending out the survey earlier).	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; both present improvements and intended improvements are provided; for both, specific details are given. Either present improvements or intended improvements must encompass a major revision. (e.g., will ask staff to help revise survey items to more closely align with outcomes. Survey will be sent to all students within first two weeks of semester and \$50 gift card will be raffled off to students who complete it).	

**If a program receives a score of exemplary in at least 8 elements, it will automatically receive a score of at least “Good” for element 6b

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.