

The University of Mississippi Assessment Evaluation Rubric for Administrative & Educational Support Units
(including Research & Public Service Units)

3 (excellent)

2 (acceptable)

1 (in need of improvement)

PLAN: Outcome Statement			
<i>An appropriate Outcome measures unit's services and processes</i>	Outcome is stated in terms of current services or processes or what clients know or are able to do as a result of services	Outcome statement is not clearly stated in terms of current services or processes or learning outcomes (what clients know, or can do as a result of services)	Outcome is stated in terms of unit characteristics or inputs or in terms of unit's strategic Outcomes (future oriented), or directly relates to individual's performance
<i>An Outcome Statement should be focused</i>	Statement describes a single, focused Outcome	Statement describes two or more Outcomes that are related	Statement describes multiple, unrelated Outcomes
<i>Unit must have some responsibility/control for Outcome</i>	Unit has full or significant responsibility/control for Outcome	Unit has modest responsibility/control for Outcome	Unit has little or no responsibility/control for Outcome
PLAN: Means of Assessment			
<i>Multiple Means of Assessment (MOA) strengthen findings</i>	More than one Means of Assessment are proposed	One Means of Assessment is proposed	No Means of Assessment is proposed
<i>Means of Assessment (MOA) must be valid to assess services, processes, or learning</i>	At least one MOA directly measures services using rubrics, counts, percentages, or other appropriate measures	Means of Assessment use only client surveys that are indirect measures.	Means of Assessment measure strategic Outcomes or pose "yes/no" results
<i>Means of Assessment must be linked to the Outcome</i>	Means of Assessment reasonably measure all aspects of the Outcome statement	Means of Assessment reasonably measure some, but not all, aspects of the Outcome	Means of Assessment not directly linked to, and will not measure the desired Outcome
<i>Means of Assessment likely to identify specific areas for improvement</i>	Means of assessment and method of summarizing data will likely provide data detailed enough to identify improvements (e.g., item or component analyses).	Means of assessment or method of summarizing data will likely identify only general areas for improvement (e.g., overall scores on a survey).	(not applicable)
PLAN: Criteria for Excellence			
<i>Criteria for Excellence should be established</i>	Specific Criteria for Excellence are proposed	Criteria for Excellence are proposed but vague	Criteria for Excellence are missing

RESULTS: Data			
<i>Sufficient data reported</i>	Sufficient data reported in adequate detail to confidently assess the Outcome	Data reported, but more data and/or detail would increase confidence in the results	Inadequate data were collected to assess the Outcome
<i>Data should be linked to the Criteria for Excellence</i>	Whether or not the collected data meet the Criteria for Excellence is clear	Unclear whether data are linked to Criteria for Excellence; or, incomplete report	Data not linked to Criteria for Excellence

RESULTS: Use of Results			
<i>Assessment results spark specific improvements</i>	Specific unit improvements that clearly stem from assessment results and seem likely to improve services and/or client satisfaction are described; or, criteria for excellence were met	Vague statements are made of unit improvements	No unit improvements related to assessment results were proposed, even though Criteria for Excellence were not met
<i>Improvements should already have been implemented</i>	At least one unit improvement is already in place; or criteria for excellence were met	Unit improvements have been identified and are scheduled for implementation	Needed program improvements have not been identified

OVERALL: Entire Report			
<i>Staff should be involved in the assessment planning and implementation process</i>	Broad staff involvement in the assessment planning and implementation process is clearly evident	Some staff involvement in the assessment planning and implementation process	Staff involvement in the assessment planning and implementation process appears to be lacking
<i>Report should be clearly written</i>	Clearly written and concise	Generally well written, but parts are not clear	Poorly written, rambling, or opaque
<i>Responsive to committee feedback</i>	Plan/Report incorporates committee feedback	Plan/Report does not incorporate feedback on issues that were acceptable, but could be improved.	Plan/Report does not incorporate feedback on issues that were in need of improvement
<i>Assessment results should be used to make program improvements</i>	At least one substantial improvement stemming from assessment has been implemented; may be service, assessment process/tool, policy, or other unit-related improvement that should lead to improved services, processes, or student/client learning	Improvement stemming from assessment has been partially implemented; may be service, assessment process/tool, policy, or other unit-related improvement that should lead to improved services, processes, or student/client learning	No substantial improvement stemming from assessment has been partially or completely implemented
<i>Evidence that previous program modifications improved services</i>	Results indicate that the implemented improvements actually improved services, processes or student/client learning (may require examination of results across assessment cycles)	Results do not show improved services; however, additional improvements are proposed or additional time is required before results likely to show improvement.	(not applicable)