## Evaluation Rubric for the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER) Reports
### [For use by University Assessment Committee (UAC) Members]

| Program or Unit Name: | |
|---|---|
| Name of Program Coordinator(s): | |
| Reviewed by UAC Members: | |

| Date of Initial UAC Review | Date Resubmission Required (if applicable) | Date of Final UAC Approval |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**Mission Statement: A clear, concise statement outlining the work of the program/unit and who it serves.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Acceptable (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No mission is articulated for the program. | General statement of intent of the unit/ program. Focus not evident. | Statement of the program's purpose is clear and concise. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| No link to institutional mission is evident. | Does not demonstrate clear alignment with the institutional mission. | Aligned and consistent with the institutional mission statement. | Demonstrates awareness of current discipline or organization norms. | |
| | Mission relates to the division/ college/ department, but not degree program or unit. | Unique to program (identifies how it separates from other units or programs. | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or Objectives: Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or enhance through the academic program; for administrative units, describe desired quality and impact of key services.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No SLOs/outcomes evident. | No alignment with program/unit mission and goals. | Alignment with program/unit mission and goals. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| SLOs/outcomes are not measurable. | Describe a process rather than an outcome. | Three to five program SLOs or outcomes are listed. | SLOs reflect depth of learning and discipline specific body of knowledge. | |

| | | Incomplete list of outcomes; less than two outcomes. | At least two SLOs/outcomes are assessed this cycle. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SLOs/outcomes do not address the knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program/unit. | SLOs/outcomes address the knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program/ unit. | | |
| | | | Appropriate for program level (undergraduate, graduate). | | |
| | | | Outcomes assessed are clearly identified. | | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | |

**Assessment Methods/Measures: The methods/measures used to gather data and evaluate each outcome.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No relationship between outcomes and measures. | Indirect relationship to outcomes. | Each method matches the outcome being assessed. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| No measures or criteria are indicated. | Methods are not appropriate for the outcomes being measured. Methodology is questionable. | The outcomes are assessed through direct and indirect measures. | More than two SLO's are assessed using multiple measures. | |
| | Appropriate use of indirect measure; however, direct measures <u>must</u> be included. | At least two outcomes are assessed. | Sufficient details and clarity of methods; instrument examples provided. | |
| | Only one outcome is assessed. The assessment of at least two outcomes is required. | Multiple measures are used for some or all of the outcomes. | | |
| **Comments:** | | | | |

**Assessment Criteria/Benchmarks: Target or benchmark that will represent success of achievement for outcomes being assessed.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No criteria, targets or benchmarks provided. | Criteria are not aligned with measures and/or outcomes. | Criteria are aligned with the measures and outcomes. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| | Criteria are too general; not specific or measurable. | Criteria are specific and measurable. | Criteria exemplify program-level rigor. | |
| | Criteria are too vague or may not reasonable (too high/too low). | Two measures are identified for each outcome. | Criteria are meaningful based on existing standards. | |
| | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

## Section II: Analysis of Results

**Interpretation of Results/Findings: Summary of results, to include data collection and analysis procedures.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No data collected. | Limited information provided about data collection and findings. | Sufficient and complete information provided to understand data collection process and findings. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| No information provided about data collection or findings. | No clear indication of who is assessed, how assessed or when assessment takes place. | Evidence provided to indicate established criteria were addressed and the level of attainment. | Provides solid evidence that targets were met and compares new findings to past results. | |
| | Misalignment between assessment methodology and data collection. | Aligned with criteria and evaluated with appropriate methodology. | | |

**Dissemination of Results: Involvement of stakeholders in discussion of results and planned actions.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No evidence of communication. | Information provided to limited number of stakeholders; no clear communication process. | Information provided to appropriate stakeholders; enough details provided in report. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| | | Evidence that assessment findings are shared and discussed with appropriate constituents. | Information provided to all stakeholders; dissemination process clearly detailed in report. | |

**Action Plans/ Use of Results: Actions taken to improve the program/unit or process based on results.**

| No Evidence (0) | Needs Improvement (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exemplary (3) | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No mention of use of results. | Some mention of improvement but no link between findings and outcomes. | Results are documented and directly related to assessment findings and outcomes. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* | |
| | Too general; no no timeframe or responsible person(s) identified | Examples of improvement are specific and directly related to assessment findings and outcomes. Sufficient reflection on what was learned during assessment cycle. | Clear understanding of findings and implications. Manageable action plan is exhibited to address areas identified as needing monitoring or enhancement. | |