

Student Affairs Assessment Review Rubric

Name of Unit: MNO Unit

Date: November 2008

Category	Beginning	Developing	Proficient
OUTCOMES			
<i>Related to Goals and Mission</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes often incongruent with the goals and mission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes somewhat aligned with the goals and mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes clearly aligned with goals and mission
<i>Clarity</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are not defined, or are not clearly defined, with respect to program, service or student development & learning <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes do not distinguish what designees should know, experience, appreciate or to be able to do	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are somewhat defined with respect to program, service or student development & learning <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes intermittently distinguishes what designees should know, experience, appreciate or to be able to do	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are clearly defined (program, service or student development & learning) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes clearly distinguish what designees should know, experience, appreciate or to be able to do
<i>Utility</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes lack detail to be useful in decision-making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes suggest some general directions for decision-making but not uniformly or comprehensively	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes consistently detailed and meaningful enough to guide decision-making in program planning and improvement
<i>Measurable/Observable</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are not measurable/observable	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are somewhat measurable/observable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are measurable/observable
<i>Criteria for Achievement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Criteria for achievement not stated or clear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criteria for achievement for outcomes are somewhat clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Criteria for achievement are stated clearly
COMMENTS:			
<i>The Cardio Center services are not necessarily linked to the University Centers outcomes. Unit would benefit from linking customer satisfaction with larger departmental outcomes. The "satisfaction" of members could be more clearly defined and would likely benefit the training curriculum and goals.</i>			
ASSESSMENT METHODS			
<i>Appropriate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Methods did not measure the outcome or are not appropriate to measure outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Some or most of the assessment methods were appropriate to measure outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistently identified and used appropriate assessment method to measure outcomes and are valid, realistic and reliable
<i>Methods</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No methods reported or limited use of only one type of measure	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited use of observable measures, or occasionally used multiple methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Both measurable/observable methods of evidence used and multiple sources of evidence used
COMMENTS:			
<i>Customer satisfaction is assessed using only one formalized method. Mall intercept surveys, informal questions, and observations would improve the depth of the inquiry into service.</i>			

Category	Beginning	Developing	Proficient
RESULTS <i>Analysis</i> <i>Reporting</i> <i>Evaluation/Interpretation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Results not reported or analyzed ineffectively or inappropriately <input type="checkbox"/> Results either not reported or reported outside the context of outcomes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No interpretation given to historical, organization, and longitudinal context	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results reported and somewhat analyzed effectively and appropriately <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results reported with some attention to the context of outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Results reported and some interpretation given to historical, organization, and longitudinal context	<input type="checkbox"/> Effective and appropriate analysis of results <input type="checkbox"/> Results reported and presented in the context of outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Results reported and interpreted with consideration given to historical, organization, longitudinal context
COMMENTS: <i>The analysis presented is missing important data such as response rate and number of participants invited to participate. Also, what longitudinal data is available to communicate the changes, if any, from past surveys? Is it possible that this is an improvement over past evaluations? The unit would benefit from a discussion of past as well as contextual findings. Such as recent policy development and its potential impact on the student service.</i>			
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE <i>Implications of Results</i> <i>Sharing of Results and Implications</i> <i>Budgetary Issues</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes no or little explanation for how the assessment results were or could be used by the unit <input type="checkbox"/> No or limited evidence of consultation and collaboration with constituents regarding assessment strategies, decision making and use of results <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No consideration for budget implications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Includes some explanation for how the assessment results were or could be used by the unit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some or limited sharing of assessment strategies, evidence, and decision-making with relevant constituents <input type="checkbox"/> Plan of action seems to have budget implications, but they are not discussed	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes detailed explanation for how the assessment results were or could be used by the unit <input type="checkbox"/> Thorough sharing of assessment strategies, evidence, and resulting decisions regarding improvements with relevant constituents <input type="checkbox"/> Budget implications for plan of action are discussed where relevant
COMMENTS: <i>Student employees could play a role in budget discussions. Talking with employees about the results can help them connect to their role in the facility more completely.</i>			
ASSESSMENT CYCLE <i>Looping</i> <i>Involvement of Stakeholders</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No or little understanding of the need and/or commitment to continue the assessment cycle <input type="checkbox"/> Plan lacking involvement of stakeholders in development and implementation	<input type="checkbox"/> Some general understanding of the need and commitment to continue the assessment cycle <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some degree of input of stakeholders, but unclear or limited participation of them in the assessment cycle	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrated commitment to continue the assessment cycle (timelines set, search for improved strategies, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Plan to involve stakeholders in discussions, input and implementation of the assessment cycle
COMMENTS: <i>Certainly the unit is aware of the looping process, but did not comment in the written report. The student employees may play a strong role in the improvement of the service component.</i>			