**Student Affairs Assessment Review Rubric**

Name of Unit: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category**  | **Beginning**  | **Developing**  | **Proficient** |
| **OUTCOMES***Related to Goals and Mission of Campus, Division, Department**Clarity**Utility**Measurable/Observable**Criteria for Achievement* | □ Outcomes often incongruent with the goals and mission□ Learning outcomes are not defined, or are not clearly defined□ Outcomes do not distinguish whatdesignees should know, experience,appreciate or to be able to do□ Outcomes lack detail to be useful indecision-making□ Outcomes are not measurable/observable□ Criteria for achievement not stated orclear | □ Outcomes somewhat aligned with the goals and mission□ Learning outcomes are somewhat defined □ Outcomes intermittently distinguishes whatdesignees should know, experience, appreciate or to be able to do□ Outcomes suggest some general directionsfor decision-making but not uniformly orcomprehensively□ Outcomes are somewhat measurable/Observable□ Criteria for achievement for outcomes aresomewhat clear | □ Outcomes clearly aligned with goals andmission□ Learning outcomes are clearly defined □ Outcomes clearly distinguish what designeesshould know, experience, appreciate or to be able to do□ Outcomes consistently detailed and meaningful enough to guide decision-making in program planning and improvement□ Outcomes are measurable/observable□ Criteria for achievement are stated clearly |
| *COMMENTS:* |
| **ASSESSMENT METHODS***Appropriate**Methods* | □ Methods did not measure the outcomeor are not appropriate to measureoutcomes□ No methods reported or limited use ofonly one type of measure | □ Some or most of the assessment methodswere appropriate to measure outcomes□ Limited use of observable measures, oroccasionally used multiple methods | □ Consistently identified and used appropriateassessment method to measure outcomes and are valid, realistic and reliable□ Both measurable/observable methods ofevidence used and multiple sources of evidenceused |
| *COMMENTS:* |
| **Category**  | **Beginning**  | **Developing**  | **Proficient** |
| **RESULTS***Analysis**Reporting**Evaluation/Interpretation* | □ Results not reported or analyzedineffectively or inappropriately□ Results either not reported or reportedoutside the context of outcomes□ No interpretation given to historical,organization, and longitudinal context | □ Results reported and somewhat analyzed effectively and appropriately□ Results reported with some attention to the context of outcomes□ Results reported and some interpretation given to historical, organization, and longitudinal context | □ Effective and appropriate analysis of results□ Results reported and presented in the context of outcomes□ Results reported and interpreted withconsideration given to historical, organization, longitudinal context |
| *COMMENTS:* |
| **IMPLICATIONS FOR****PRACTICE***Implications of Results**Sharing of Results and**Implications**Budgetary Issues (N/A)* | □ Includes no or little explanation forhow the assessment results were or could be used by the unit□ No or limited evidence of consultationand collaboration with constituentsregarding assessment strategies, decision making and use of results□ No consideration for budgetimplications | □ Includes some explanation for how theassessment results were or could be used by the unit□ Some or limited sharing of assessmentstrategies, evidence, and decision-making with relevant constituents□ Plan of action seems to have budgetimplications, but they are not discussed | □ Includes detailed explanation for how the assessment results were or could be used by the unit□ Thorough sharing of assessment strategies, evidence, and resulting decisions regarding improvements with relevant constituents□ Budget implications for plan of action are discussed where relevant |
| *COMMENTS:* |
| **ASSESSMENT CYCLE***Looping**Involvement of**Stakeholders* | □ No or little understanding of the needand/or commitment to continue theassessment cycle□ Plan lacking involvement ofstakeholders in development andimplementation | □ Some general understanding of the need and commitment to continue the assessment cycle□ Some degree of input of stakeholders, butunclear or limited participation of them in theassessment cycle | □ Demonstrated commitment to continue theassessment cycle (timelines set, search forimproved strategies, etc.)□ Plan to involve stakeholders in discussions,input and implementation of the assessment cycle |
| *COMMENTS:* |
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