

Assessment Feedback Rubric: Programs/Units with Operational Outcomes

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Version 2.0: 8/31/16

Beginning	Developing	Mature	Exemplary
Outcomes: These are the expected consequences/impact of core unit activities (e.g., service, research, student support). Operational outcomes or objectives describe intended benefits for stakeholders (e.g., student well-being)—rather than activities performed/services provided to create those benefits (e.g., counseling).			
01. Number of Outcomes (maximum rating is “Mature”)			
No outcomes included in plan.	1-2 outcomes present; or an excessive number that may be difficult to manage.	A reasonably robust yet manageable number of outcomes (e.g., 3-5).	n/a
02. Specificity of Outcome Statements			
No outcomes included; or statements worded as activities rather than desired impact/consequences/benefits.	Some outcomes are specific (e.g., precise verbs/details), modular (i.e., not overly broad or complex), and conducive to measurement.	Most outcomes are specific (e.g., precise verbs/details), modular (i.e., not overly broad or complex), and conducive to measurement.	All outcomes are specific (e.g., precise verbs/details), modular (i.e., not overly broad or complex), and conducive to measurement.
03. Rigor of Outcomes			
No outcomes included.	Some outcomes seem important/central to the mission and role of the unit (i.e., they reflect what the unit aspires to accomplish).	Most outcomes seem important/central to the mission and role of the unit (i.e., they reflect what the unit aspires to accomplish).	All outcomes seem important/central to the mission and role of the unit (i.e., they reflect what the unit aspires to accomplish).
Activity Mapping: If applicable, an activity map can be used to show how specific activities, services, projects, etc., contribute to the attainment of larger outcomes/goals/objectives. Creating an activity map is optional for non-instructional units.			
04. Mapping of Activities and Desired Outcomes (where applicable)			
No activity map included with assessment plan.	Activities/projects listed in map (or elsewhere), but links to/coverage of outcomes not indicated.	Map shows coverage of outcomes in activities/services/projects using basic notation (e.g., “X” or check mark).	Map shows coverage of outcomes in activities/services/projects using tiered notation (to indicate intended degree of impact, relative cost, etc.).
Methods: What assessment measures/indicators/metrics are employed to determine if outcomes are achieved? How/when are data collected and evaluated?			
05. Number of Measures			
No measures/metrics included.	Some outcomes have associated measures/metrics.	Every outcome has an associated measure/metric.	Multiple measures/metrics for most outcomes.
06. Alignment between Measures and Outcomes			
No measures/metrics; or measures don’t seem specific/direct enough to match outcomes.	At superficial level, most measures seem to match outcomes (e.g., “Outcome X is measured with a survey”).	General detail provided about alignment (e.g., metrics or survey questions were developed/selected to match outcomes).	Links between measures and outcomes provided or delineated (e.g., survey attached; metrics explained).
07. Expectations for Achievement (a.k.a. Targets)			
No reference to a priori expectations included.	Expectations stated but lacking in specificity (e.g., “growth”) or rigor (i.e., arbitrary low bar); or “Collecting baseline data.”	Expectations specified (e.g., “5% increase in Metric Y”; or “80% reported satisfaction...”) without stated rationale/explanation.	Expectations specified and justified (e.g., “10% decrease in service response time after implementation of new software system”).

Beginning	Developing	Mature	Exemplary
08. Systematic, Ongoing Process for Collecting/Evaluating Data (Multi-Year Schedule)			
No indication of when data will be collected beyond current year.	Future data collection and evaluation timeline (3-to-5 year horizon) provided for some measures.	Future data collection and evaluation timeline (3-to-5 year horizon) provided for most measures.	Future data collection and evaluation timeline (3-to-5 year horizon) provided for all measures.
09. Data Collection/Evaluation Details			
Little or no information provided about data collection and evaluation procedures.	Limited description provided about data collection/evaluation procedures (e.g., "Attendance rate").	Enough detail provided that a layperson could understand the general process for data collection and evaluation.	Data collection and evaluation procedures fully described (e.g., who, what, where, when), including any software/metrics utilized.
010. Trustworthiness of Data Collection/Evaluation Methods			
No evidence that methods are likely to yield trustworthy results.	Basic approach logical, but more detail needed or methodological flaws/gaps apparent (e.g., unrep. sampling; no quality control check [QC] of data).	Methods seem sound; some efforts to foster trustworthiness described (e.g., QC check of data; use of established systems/tools for tracking/analysis).	Methods seem robust and likely to yield results that can be trusted (e.g., independent replication of analyses; triangulation via multiple measures).
Results/Analysis: This section includes summary results (relative to expectations) and more detailed interpretation/analysis—what do the results mean to the unit? What do they say about the impact of programming? How do they compare to prior results? Are there relative strengths, weaknesses, or avenues for improvement?			
011. Presentation of Summary Results			
Results absent or seemingly unrelated to desired outcomes and expectations/targets.	Some summary results presented clearly and related directly to outcomes and expectations/targets (e.g., "Accuracy was 78%, well below our 90% target").	Most summary results presented clearly and related directly to outcomes and expectations/targets (e.g., "Accuracy was 78%, well below our 90% target").	All summary results presented clearly and related directly to outcomes and expectations/ targets (e.g., "Accuracy was 78%, well below our 90% target").
012. Interpretation/Analysis of Results			
No results reported in this cycle; or no attempt at interpretation/analysis.	Interpretations seem unsupported by data/methods; or interpretations are minimal and do not go beyond summary findings (e.g., "Expectations were met; no need for action").	Interpretations seem reasonable and "drill down" in at least one way (e.g., relative strengths/weaknesses; subgroup comparisons; gap analysis).	Interpretations seem reasonable and "drill down" in multiple ways (e.g., relative strengths/weaknesses; subgroup comparisons; gap analysis), with reference to improvement needs.
Use of Results: Based on the results and analysis, what actions does your unit plan to take to achieve or further achieve expectations?			
013. Action Plan: Impact (on efficiency, accuracy, productivity, satisfaction, services, etc.)			
No action plans; or no apparent reference in plan to improving efficiency, accuracy, productivity, satisfaction with services, etc.	Described plan does not flow logically from results, seems unrealistic, or is vague/underdeveloped (e.g., "We plan to develop a plan to improve").	Plan seems logical but may lack detail such as timelines (e.g., "We will review existing procedures"; "We will revise our training process").	Plan seems manageable, based directly on results, and sufficiently detailed to positively impact efficiency, accuracy, productivity, satisfaction, etc.
014. Action Plan: Assessment Process (Note—units rated Mature or better on dimensions 9 and 10 will automatically receive a Mature rating here)			
No action plans.	Described plan to enhance assessment process does not have a clear rationale or is vague/underdeveloped (e.g., "We will review measure/metric X").	Plan to enhance process is based on critical review and seems logical; or evidence that existing process is mature and needs no alteration.	Plan seems manageable, logical, and sufficiently detailed to enhance/build assessment process in a timely way.