

Rubric for Evaluating Annual Assessment Reports

This rubric is designed to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of assessment reports submitted by Academic & Student Support Centers/Programs. Scores should reflect the depth, coherence, and utility of each report component in supporting the center's/program's mission and program objectives.

Criterion	Absent / Unacceptable (0) <i>(Missing or wholly inadequate)</i>	Insufficient / Needs Improvement (1) <i>(Present but underdeveloped or unclear)</i>	Adequate / Acceptable (2) <i>(Reasonable and functional, though not outstanding)</i>	Strong / Exemplary (3) <i>(Clear, well-executed, and useful as a model for others)</i>
Criterion 1: Clarity, Quality, and Appropriateness of Program Objectives/Outcomes (POs)	Objectives/outcomes are missing or wholly inappropriate. Existing POs use vague verbs (e.g., "know," "understand"), lack clear scope, or are unreasonably broad or complex. Objectives/outcomes do not reflect the mission or are not assessable.	Objectives/outcomes are present but underdeveloped. Some are vague or over-complex, or the total number appears excessive or insufficient given the scope of the center/program. Alignment with mission or assessability is questionable.	Objectives/outcomes are mostly clear and reasonable. Most use precise, observable verbs and describe specific clear objectives/outcomes. The number of POs is appropriate to the size and structure of the center/program and feasible for assessment within a three-year cycle.	All Objectives/outcomes are exceptionally well-crafted—clear, specific, measurable, and aligned with center's/program's mission. The number is both meaningful and sustainable, supporting a coherent and manageable assessment plan.
Criterion 2: Quality and Appropriateness of Measures and Methods	No measures described, or all are indirect with no connection to the PO.	At least one direct measure is present, but methods are underdeveloped, weakly aligned to the outcome, or inadequately explained.	Assessment uses at least one solid direct measure well-aligned to the PO. Methods are described with enough clarity to understand what was assessed and how. Measures are appropriate to the skill or knowledge domain.	Assessment is multi-faceted and thoughtfully designed. Measures are clearly explained, well-aligned to POs, and include both direct and (where appropriate) indirect components that strengthen the reliability and depth of findings.
Criterion 3: Interpretation & Insightfulness of Assessment Results	No interpretation or analysis provided. Results are presented as raw data (if at all) with no commentary or context.	Some basic interpretation is offered, but it's shallow, purely descriptive, or disconnected from student learning. Lacks insight into causes or patterns. No evident attempt to derive meaning or implications for the center/program.	Results are clearly analyzed and interpreted in relation to the PO. The report identifies patterns, trends, or areas of concern, and includes reasonable inferences about student learning. Some effort is made to connect findings to future improvements.	Analysis is deep, coherent, and reflects critical engagement with the data. Findings are meaningfully interpreted considering center/program mission and programming, contextual factors, and programmatic choices. The discussion yields actionable insights that are specific, grounded, and potentially transformative.
Criterion 4: Reflection on Prior Assessments and Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	No mention of past assessment findings. No evidence that previous results or action plans were considered in current assessment work.	Some reference to past assessments but unclear how (or if) prior results influenced current methods or interpretation. Little or no evidence of follow-through on prior action plans.	Clear connection to past assessment results. Prior findings are used to inform the current assessment (e.g., revised tools, methods, or focus). Some evidence of follow-through on action plans or an explanation for why changes were not made.	Strong, recursive reflection. Past results are used to refine both assessment methods and programmatic or pedagogical practice. The report documents a cycle of inquiry and improvement, including reassessment of prior areas and clear alignment with previous action plans. Evidence of intentionality and sustained follow-through is robust.
Criterion 5: Documentation and Transparency	No supporting materials provided.	Some supporting materials are referenced but are sparse or poorly labeled. Hard to understand how they connect to the assessment.	Relevant materials (e.g., rubrics, surveys, data summaries) are included and mostly clear. Support documentation enhances understanding of the assessment process.	All relevant materials are provided, well-organized, and contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the assessment. Documentation could serve as a model for other departments.