**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,