ASSESSMENT RESULTS & REPORTING

Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Assessment Results and Reporting in Student Affairs

	Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
ASSESSMENT METHODS	**Assessable Program Objectives (POs) & Learning Outcomes (LOs)**	LOs and/or POs are vague, non-specific; POs do not describe program performance expectations in a measurable way. LOs are confused with learning processes.	Through the use of specific, active verbs some POs indicate how a program can demonstrate its performance, and some LOs indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.	Each PO specifically identifies an expected performance in the form of demonstrable actions, ex. "Increase student participation in…" Each LO describes how students demonstrate their learning, ex. "Students can describe three strategies for…"	LOs describe specifically how students demonstrate their learning, and POs how program demonstrates its performance. Explicit criteria for student performance examples of varying levels of performance for a given LO are identified.
	Valid Measures	It is not clear that potentially valid evidence/data is collected for the LO or PO. Data do not seem related to the PO or LO.	Data identification or evidence needs to be further focused or aligned with the PO or LO to produce meaningful and useful results that support program improvement.	Relevant and sufficient evidence/data is collected for each PO and LO. Evidence is aligned with the LO or PO to enable meaningful results and conclusions.	Assessment tools have been pilot-tested and refined over time. Direct and indirect evidence are designed to mutually inform conclusions. Feedback has led to refinements in the assessment process.
	Reliable Results	Data collection methods produce unreliable results, i.e. if the work is repeated, different results are likely.	Most data collection methods consider reliability; i.e. effort is made to generate results representative of the population norm.	Data collection methods are explicitly designed to generate reliable results. Effort is made to ascertain the degree of reliability.	The reliability of the results is explicitly ascertained and reported. Efforts are made to maximize confidence in results and, thus, conclusions.
RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS & COMMUNICATION	**Results Summary**	Some results are reported; a summarizing table or figure is not provided.	Results are provided for most LOs and POs, including a brief narrative, data table (or other summary format) and summary of the extent to which the LO or PO was met.	Results are provided for each LO and PO, including a brief narrative, a data table (other summary format), and summary of the extent to which the LO or PO was met.	Results for each LO and PO are clearly delineated as are those for each line of evidence. Considers the extent to which the LO or PO was met in light of relevant benchmarks.
	Conclusions	Report identifies implications but no recommendations for improvement. No reasoning offered in support of claims.	For most LOs and POs, conclusions and recommendations for improvement are reported. Some claims vague or questionably related to results. Questions of validity or reliability are not addressed. Recommendations may be difficult to implement due to lack of convincing results and/or limited staff knowledge of, support of, or involvement with.	For each LO and PO Report conclusions and recommendations for improvement are reported. Includes some consideration of the reliability and validity of results. Results have been discussed by many staff and recommendations likely to be implemented due to staff involvement and support and convincing quality of results.	For both LOs and POs, well-reasoned critique of conclusions, implications, and recommendations is reported. Includes a well-reasoned discussion of validity and reliability of results. Staff discussed results, planned needed changes, and is likely to secure resources to implement changes. Efforts are made to collaborate with others to improve future performance.
	Communication	Results have not been made public or shared with students and other stakeholders.	Results are informally shared and/or with only some stakeholders including students.	Results are formally shared with some stakeholders including students.	Results are widely disseminated and feedback encouraged.

Based on C. Jenefsky & JFKU Program Review Council (2008) and WASC rubrics (2007)
Center for Research on Teaching Excellence, University of California, Merced (L.E. Martin) & UC Merced Division of Student Affairs

ASSESSMENT RESULTS & REPORTING

Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Assessment Results and Reporting in Student Affairs

This rubric has six major criteria:

(1) **Assessable Program Objectives & Learning Outcomes**: To be assessable, program objectives and learning outcomes and should involve specific, active verbs with supporting details describing respectively how students will demonstrate their learning or how a program will demonstrate its performance. For learning outcomes, avoid verbs of general cognition such as "know" or "understand" and instead use verbs like "demonstrate by" or "solve" that show how learning is applied.

(2) **Valid Evidence**: To be valid, evidence or data must bear directly on the expectation(s) described by the text of the learning outcome or objective and enable evaluation of the degree to which the objective or learning outcome was met. For learning outcomes, valid evidence must also be aligned with the criteria[2] used to evaluate student learning. Valid evidence is also linked to sample size or sampling approach, so as to be representative of a norm. For more information, see the appended selection on sample sizing from Linda Suskie's *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide* (2004).

(3) **Reliable Results**: Results are reliable if repeating the study would p results and conclusions if the study is repeated. Factors that affect reliability include sample size (generally a small number of observations produces unreliable results), sampling strategy, and, in the case of staff review of actual student work, agreement about the criteria and standards[1] by which student work will be evaluated. The latter is promoted by developing a rubric that outlines criteria and standards and training evaluators to consistently apply the rubric in the same way ('inter-rater reliability').

(4) **Summarizing Results**: When summarizing results in a table or graph, it is important to consider multiple audiences. How would staff within your program understand the results? If viewed by outside stake-holders like students, staff or faculty from other programs, administrators, parents, etc., would they reach similar conclusions? Comparing the results to previous year's results, to expectations your program has set for student learning, or to results of similar programs within or outside of the UC (i.e. benchmarking) can provide context for interpreting the results.

(5) **Conclusions and Recommendations:** An effective conclusion 'closes the loop' by implementing change on the basis of results. The narrative should address results-based conclusions and recommendations, discussing as appropriate any relevant implications of the data collection methods. For example, if students were not given a clear incentive to participate in a particular assessment, the results may not be completely reliable as students may not have been motivated to perform at their best. Specific actions should be provided since the goal is continued improvement. Changes might address improvements to the assessment process in addition to services and programming.

(6) Communication: The success of many efforts to improve program performance is enhanced by student and stakeholder awareness. Programs share their assessment results with all stakeholders to enhance program performance and support.

---

[1] Criteria are the specific skills or abilities to be measured. Standards describe the levels of performance for a given criterion (ex. proficient to exemplary) and in doing so enable their measurement. On this rubric, criteria appear in next to last, left hand column and performance standards range from initial to highly developed.

Based on C. Jenefsky & JFKU Program Review Council (2008) and WASC rubrics (2007)
Center for Research on Teaching Excellence, University of California, Merced (L.E. Martin) & UC Merced Division of Student Affairs