**Southern University at Shreveport**

**Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Reporting Rubric**

**Description**:

Assessment Unit:

Assessment Period:

Plan/Report Submitted by: Plan/Report Reviewed by: Date Reviewed:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale →****Rubric Category ↓** | **Exceeds Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Below Expectations** | **Overall Rating and** **Review Comments** |
| **Institutional Effectiveness Plan**  |  |
| **Mission Statement**  | * Clear and concise
* Specific to the program (identifies what it does that separates it from other units or programs.)
* Addresses the larger impact of the program.
* Identifies stakeholders.
* Aligned with the college and division mission and with respective professional organization, if applicable
 | * Statement of the program’s purpose and who it serves.
* Aligned with the college and division mission statements.
* Scope and reach may be limited
 | * 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.
 |  |
| **Program Outcomes (Where Applicable)** | * Plan contains a minimum of 3 outcomes
* Observable and 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 identified‐enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess.
* Uses action verbs.
* Describes the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type (BS/BA, MS/MA if applicable.
* Aligned 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.
 | * Plan contains a minimum of 3 outcomes
* Observable and measureable.
* 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.
 | * Plan contains less than 3 outcomes or no SLO’s
* Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).
* Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met.
* Incomplete‐not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program.
* Outcomes identified don't seem aligned with the program mission.
* Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.).
 |  |
| **Student Learning Outcomes (Where Applicable)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Assessment Measures and Benchmark**The instrument used to gather data to determine if the expected outcome is achieved at the level of performance identified.  | * Multiple measures for some or all outcomes.
* 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.
* Purposeful‐clear how results could be used for program improvement.
* Described with sufficient detail (documents; e.g. rubrics, assignments, attached in Document Repository, where appropriate).
* Aligned with measures and outcomes.
* Represent a reasonable level of success.
* Specific and measurable.
* Meaningful‐based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards
 | * At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome.
* Direct and indirect measures are utilized.
* Described with sufficient detail.
* Implementation may still need further planning.
* Aligned with measures and outcomes.
* Target identified for each measure.
* Specific and measurable.
* Some targets may seem arbitrary
 | * Not all outcomes have associated 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.
* Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure.
* Seem off‐base (too low/high).
 |  |
| **Institutional Effectiveness Report**  |  |
| **Results of Assessment Measures** | * 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 included in the document repository.
* \*Reports must be free of student identifiable information.
 | * 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. |  |
| **Use of Results**  | * Exhibits an understanding of the
* Implications of assessment findings.
* Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical "next steps".
* Possibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement.
* 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.
 | * 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).
 |  |

Rubric adapted from the following institutions: Indiana University South Bend, Texas A & M University,