QUALITY OF CO-CURRICULAR ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

AUBURN UNIVERSITY
STUDENT AFFAIRS
Assessment & Strategic Planning

Department: _____

Outcome Title: _____

Reporting Year: _____

Reviewer Name/s: _____

	1-Beginning	2-Developing	3-Mature	4-Exemplary
1. Type of Outcome: Correct and clear indication of whether the outcome is a student learning outcome or a program outcome. A student learning outcome measures what a student (or other stakeholder) is to know, think, or do as a result of participating in a program, course, or service. A program outcome measures what a program seeks to do, achieve, or accomplish for the purposes of improvement.				
1a. Clarity of Outcome Assignment	No outcome type is indicated.	Type of outcome is indicated; however, verbiage is not robust enough to determine if outcome is correctly assigned.	Verbiage is robust; type of outcome is indicated but is not correctly assigned according to the language of the indicated outcome type. (program/learning).	Verbiage is robust; type of outcome is indicated *AND* is correctly assigned according to the language of the indicated outcome type. (program/learning).
2. Outcome Construction: Outcome is agreed upon and shared within the functional area, is structured with the necessary components, and contains an appropriate verb (An outcome is an identifiable, measurable, end-results of a program).				
2a. Outcome Structure	No outcome is provided; or an unclear statement is included from which the structure cannot be evaluated.	An outcome is provided, and *SOME* of the following components are included: outcome is action-driven, outcome is specific; functional area is named, includes appropriate and measurable verb; indicates an audience, behavior, condition, and degree; and is realistic/attainable within the timeframe indicated.	An outcome is provided, and *MOST* of the following components are included: outcome is action-driven, outcome is specific; functional area is named, includes appropriate and measurable verb; indicates an audience, behavior, condition, and degree; and is realistic/attainable within the timeframe indicated.	An outcome is provided, and *ALL* of the following components are included: outcome is action-driven, outcome is specific; functional area is named, includes appropriate and measurable verb; indicates an audience, behavior, condition, and degree; and is realistic/attainable within the timeframe indicated.
2b. Staff Consensus	The report does not indicate that a discussion regarding outcome development took place *NOR* that consensus among functional area staff members was achieved.	There is evidence that some discussion took place regarding the development of the outcome; however, the report did not indicate inclusivity among *ALL* staff within the functional area *NOR* did the report indicate that departmental priorities and initiatives to support intuitional and division-wide plans were considered.	There is evidence that a discussion took place regarding the development of the outcome *AND* the report indicated that departmental priorities and initiatives to support intuitional and division-wide plans were considered; however, the report did not indicate inclusivity among *ALL* staff within the functional area.	The report indicates that this outcome was developed through a collaborative process in which *ALL* functional area staff members were included in a discussion about departmental priorities and initiatives to support institutional and division-wide plans.
2c. Outcome Communication	The report does not indicate that the outcome was communicated (directly or indirectly) to staff or affiliated students.	There is evidence that this outcome was made public (e.g. available on website); however, it does not appear that the outcome was intentionally shared with staff or affiliated students.	There is evidence that this outcome was intentionally shared with functional area staff (e.g. staff meeting, email, etc.) *OR* affiliated students (e.g. student officer meetings, student employee trainings, orientations, etc.).	There is evidence that this outcome was intentionally shared with functional area staff *AND* affiliated students (e.g. student officer meetings, student employee trainings, orientations, etc.).
3. Action Steps: A list of the incremental tasks necessary to achieve broader objectives including a description of the assigned personnel and timeframe for each item.				
3a. Steps for Outcome Achievement	No action steps provided.	Action steps are provided; however, *NO* indicated timeframe *NOR* assigned personnel were included for achieving each action step.	Action steps are provided and *SOME* items included an indicated timeframe and/or assigned personnel were included for achieving each action step.	Action steps are provided and *ALL* items included an indicated timeframe *AND* assigned personnel were included for achieving each action step.
4. Method: Description of methodology utilized to assess the outcome through direct or indirect methods.				
4a. Method Alignment	No measures provided *OR* no evidence of outcome-measure alignment.	A *vague* description of the method was provided; however, it was unclear if method measured what was stated in the outcome; *AND* unclear if the method of choice was appropriate for the type of outcome indicated (e.g. direct measure for learning outcome).	A *detailed* description of the method was provided; it was unclear if method measured what was stated in the outcome *OR* it was unclear if method of choice was appropriate for the type of outcome indicated (e.g. direct measure for learning outcome).	A *detailed* description of the method was provided; method measured what was stated in the outcome; *AND* the method of choice was appropriate for the type of outcome indicated (e.g. direct measure for learning outcome).

	1-Beginning	2-Developing	3-Mature	4-Exemplary
4b. Data Collection	The report does not reveal information concerning data collection procedures.	The report includes *SOME* description of the data collection process; however, the description is too vague to make inferences regarding methodological soundness.	The report includes *MOST* details such as dates, sampling procedures, sample sizes, survey questions, scales, administration technique, steps for analysis, etc.; and information is sufficient to evaluate methodological soundness.	The report includes *ALL* details such as dates, sampling procedures, sample sizes, survey questions, scales, administration technique, steps for analysis, etc. AND the process appears to be methodologically sound.
5. Findings: Assessment results reported and interpreted in relation to the student learning outcomes and communicated with program faculty.				
5a. Reporting Findings	No summary of findings was reported.	A summary of findings was described including *SOME* of the following: congruence between the type of data obtained and the data analysis method/s, strengths and weaknesses of results, interpretation of results in the context of improvement, findings interpreted within the appropriate scope (e.g. generalizability), comparison data if available, *AND* notation of whether the outcome was met.	A summary of findings was described including *MOST* of the following: congruence between the type of data obtained and the data analysis method/s, strengths and weaknesses of results, interpretation of results in the context of improvement, findings interpreted within the appropriate scope (e.g. generalizability), comparison data if available, *AND* notation of whether the outcome was met.	A thorough summary of findings was described including *ALL* of the following: congruence between the type of data obtained and the data analysis method/s, strengths and weaknesses of results, interpretation of results in the context of improvement, findings interpreted within the appropriate scope (e.g. generalizability), comparison data if available, *AND* notation of whether the outcome was met.
5b. Interpretation of Findings	The report did not include any interpretation of findings.	The report included *some* interpretation of findings; however, the description of the interpretation was vague *AND* was unrelated to the outcome and findings.	The report included a clear interpretation of findings; and the interpretation related to the outcome and findings; however, the report did not thoroughly address issues that may have affected findings.	The report included a clear interpretation of findings; the interpretation related to the outcome and findings; *AND* the report considered issues that affected findings (e.g. limitations, environmental factors, flawed instrument, multiple influences on the phenomenon in question, etc.).
6. Use of Findings for Improvement: Summary and communication plan for the improvements to be made to a program or initiative, as determined from findings.				
6a. Process Reflection/Intended Actions	No evidence of process reflection or plan for intended action.	The report described a plan for improvement; however, the report did not address linkages to outcome findings, a plan for addressing weaknesses, *NOR* a plan for improvements to the assessment process.	The report described action for improvement *based on outcome findings*; however, the report did not include a plan for addressing weaknesses identified in findings *AND/OR* did not outline improvements to the assessment process.	The report described action for improvement *based on outcome findings*; included a plan for addressing weaknesses identified in findings; outlined improvements to the assessment process to include a plan for reassessment.
6b. Sharing Results	The report provided no evidence that findings or plans for improvements were communicated with functional area staff members *NOR* other stakeholders.	The report includes evidence that findings and plans for improvement were communicated with *SOME* functional area staff members and/or other stakeholders.	The report includes evidence that findings and plans for improvement were communicated with *ALL* functional area staff members *AND* other stakeholders.	The report includes evidence that findings and plans for improvement were communicated with *ALL* functional area staff members and other stakeholders *AND* there was a dedicated time for this discussion among staff members.
7. Related: Indication of linkages between outcome and divisional and institutional initiatives.				
7a. Linkages to Strategic Initiatives	The outcome was not related to a division *NOR* institutional initiative.	The outcome was related; however, it was not related to both a division and institutional initiative *OR* the outcome was related to more than one division initiative or more than one institutional initiative.	The outcome was related to both a division and institutional initiative; however, the outcome was related to more than one division initiative *OR* more than one institutional initiative.	The outcome was related to both a division and institutional initiative; the outcome was related to *only one* division initiative and *only one* institutional initiative.

(Adapted from AU Office of Academic Assessment)

©Auburn University 2021