

Rubric for Reviewing Support Unit Reports (Planning)

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
<p>1. Mission Statement:</p> <p>(1). Provide a summary of the purpose and essential functions of the unit. Include the primary group(s) the unit serves (e.g., unique student populations, faculty, prospective students, etc.).</p> <p>(2). If the unit only serves students at a specific geographic location (e.g., Taos, Houston, Galveston, Fort Worth, abroad sites, etc.), this should be noted. Indicate whether the unit serves students at multiple locations (e.g., distance education students or students at approved off-site locations).</p> <p>(3). In the event services are provided through contracts or third parties, please include that information as well.</p>	<p>Clearly and concisely summarizes the purpose and essential function of the unit, including the primary group(s) the unit serves (e.g., unique student populations, faculty, prospective students, etc.).</p> <p>Clearly identifies the location(s) where the support services are delivered.</p> <p>Clearly states whether the support services are provided through contracts or third parties.</p>	<p>Generally summarizes the purpose and essential function of the unit, including the primary group(s) the unit serves (e.g., unique student populations, faculty, prospective students, etc.). Some elements of the mission statement may lack detail or precision.</p> <p>Clearly identifies the location(s) where the support services are delivered.</p> <p>Clearly states whether the support services are provided through contracts or third parties.</p>	<p>Partially summarizes the purpose and essential function of the unit, including the primary group(s) the unit serves (e.g., unique student populations, faculty, prospective students, etc.). Some key elements of the program may not be reflected in the mission statement.</p> <p>May or may not identify the location(s) where support services are delivered.</p> <p>May or may not state whether the support services are provided through contracts or third parties.</p>	<p>Vague and unclear summary of the purpose and essential function of the unit, including the primary group(s) the unit serves (e.g., unique student populations, faculty, prospective students, etc.).</p> <p>May or may not identify the location(s) where support services are delivered.</p> <p>May or may not state whether the support services are provided through contracts or third parties.</p>	<p>No data entered</p>
<p>2. Unit Objectives (UOs):</p> <p>Statements that identify the key services and operations of the unit and define what they would look like in a high-functioning unit.</p>	<p>All objective(s) stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the action/outcome, and specification of what will be assessed (e.g., employment rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p>	<p>All objective(s) stated with general clarity and specificity including predominantly precise verbs, description of the action/outcome, and specification of what will be assessed (e.g., employment</p>	<p>Most objective(s) are stated with partial clarity and specificity including some precise verbs, minimal description of the action/outcome. Some objectives specify what will be assessed (e.g., employment</p>	<p>Objective(s) are absent or vague, lacking clarity and specificity. Verbs are imprecise. There is no description of the action/outcome. Objectives do not specify what will be assessed (e.g., employment rates</p>	<p>No data entered</p>

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	<p>All objective(s) follow logically from the unit/program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>All objectives provide an opportunity to measure unit/program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p> <p>Each support unit must establish at least 3 UOs and assess at least 2 UOs per year.</p> <p><u>If a support unit includes student learning outcomes,</u></p> <p>All outcomes stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill, and specification of who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p> <p>All outcomes stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p>	<p>rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>All objective(s) follow logically from the unit/program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>Most objectives provide an opportunity to measure unit/program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p> <p>Each support unit must establish at least 3 UOs and assess at least 2 UOs per year.</p> <p><u>If a support unit includes student learning outcomes,</u></p> <p>All outcomes are stated with general clarity and specificity including predominantly precise verbs, description of the content/skill, and specification of who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p> <p>All outcomes stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p>	<p>rates at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>Some objective(s) follow logically from the unit/program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>Objectives generally do not provide an opportunity to measure unit/program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p> <p>Support unit establishes less than 3 UOs and or does not assess at least 2 UOs per year.</p> <p><u>If a support unit includes student learning outcomes,</u></p> <p>Most outcomes are stated with partial clarity and specificity including some precise verbs, minimal description of the content/skill. Some outcomes specify who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p> <p>Outcomes are generally not stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).</p>	<p>at graduation among Ph.D. students).</p> <p>Objective(s) do not follow logically from the unit/program’s mission and/or SMU strategic goals.</p> <p>Objectives do not provide an opportunity to measure unit/program quality and impact through substantive and detailed data collection.</p> <p>Support unit establishes less than 3 UOs and or does not assess at least 2 UOs per year.</p> <p><u>If a support unit includes student learning outcomes,</u></p> <p>Outcomes are vague, lack clarity and specificity. Verbs are imprecise. There is no description of the content/skill. Outcomes do not specify who should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.S. program”).</p> <p>Outcomes are not stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student</p>	

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
<p>3. Measures:</p> <p>Measures describe the methods of collecting and evaluating assessment data. A strong measure description makes the assessment strategy easy for internal stakeholders to replicate and easy to understand by an external party who is not intimately involved in the day-to-day operations of the program.</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is clearly explained and logical.</p> <p>All outcomes/objectives assessed using multiple measures, at least one of which is a direct measure (e.g., decrease in wait time, growth in service capacity, or reductions in cost of performance).</p> <p>Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., Last year 75% of OIT help tickets were acknowledged within 24 hours. X changes were made to the triage system, so we hope that 85% of OIT help tickets will be acknowledged with 24 hours).</p> <p>The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results.</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is generally explained and logical.</p> <p>All outcomes/objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., decrease in wait time, growth in service capacity, or reductions in cost of performance).</p> <p>Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., Last year 75% of OIT help tickets were acknowledged within 24 hours. X changes were made to the triage system, so we hope that 85% of OIT help tickets will be acknowledged with 24 hours).</p> <p>The data collection process is generally explained and generally appropriate to the specification of desired results.</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is partially explained and in most cases logical.</p> <p>Most outcomes/objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., decrease in wait time, growth in service capacity, or reductions in cost of performance).</p> <p>Desired result specified but not justified (e.g., OIT will respond to most customers within 24 hours).</p> <p>The data collection process is partially explained and is somewhat appropriate to the specification of desired results</p>	<p>Relationship between measure and outcome(s)/objective(s) is unclear and illogical.</p> <p>Outcomes/objectives may not be assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., decrease in wait time, growth in service capacity, or reductions in cost of performance).</p> <p>Desired result is neither specified nor justified (e.g., OIT will respond to customers).</p> <p>The data collection process is not explained and/or not appropriate to the specification of desired results.</p>	<p>No data entered</p>
<p>4. Targets:</p> <p>A benchmark by which performance will be evaluated (e.g., threshold(s) of acceptability used to determine success).</p>	<p>Targets are clearly defined for all outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>All targets align with the unit/program’s mission and outcomes/objectives.</p>	<p>Targets are clearly defined for most outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>Most targets align with the unit/program’s mission and objectives.</p>	<p>Some targets are defined, but they lack clarity and specificity.</p> <p>Targets may not be directly aligned with the</p>	<p>Targets are either not defined at all or are extremely vague and lack specificity.</p>	

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	All targets are specific and leave no room for ambiguity.	Most targets are specific and clear.	unit/program’s mission or objectives. Targets are somewhat vague and may not provide a clear measure of success.	Targets are not aligned with the unit/program’s mission or objectives.	
<p>5. Results and Findings:</p> <p>(1). Provide results and findings from the information collected through the measures.</p> <p>(2). Interpret results.</p>	<p>Status for all targets is provided.</p> <p>Results are present, and they directly relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives, are clearly presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) provided for all assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results are clearly reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. And, interpretation includes how activities have affected results.</p> <p>Clear evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.</p>	<p>Status for all targets is provided.</p> <p>Results are present, and they generally relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives, are generally presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results are generally reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. And, interpretation includes how activities might have affected results.</p> <p>Some evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.</p>	<p>Status for some targets is provided.</p> <p>Some results are present, and they may or may not relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives, are partially presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) may or may not be provided for assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results may or may not be reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Interpretation may or may not include an explanation of how activities affected results.</p> <p>No evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.</p>	<p>No target’s status is provided.</p> <p>Results are not presented, or results do not relate to outcomes/objectives and the desired results for outcomes/objectives presented.</p> <p>Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year’s) are not provided for assessments in addition to current year’s.</p> <p>Interpretation of results is missing or does not relate to the given objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Interpretation does not include an explanation of how activities affected results.</p> <p>No evidence is provided that this step was accomplished.</p>	No data entered

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
<p>6. Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plan):</p> <p>Every unit or program is expected to establish and submit a minimum of one action plan for improvement regardless of whether all targets are met.</p>	<p>Clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) were used to develop the plan.</p> <p>Unit/Program outlines a well-structured plan for improvement, including specific actions, responsible parties, timelines, and a clear re-assessment schedule.</p> <p>The update clearly articulates how assessment results have directly informed decisions and impacted unit/program effectiveness.</p>	<p>Action plans for improvement are acknowledged, and there is reasonable detail provided.</p> <p>Some actions taken or planned for improvement are described with a moderate level of detail. Implementation details such as responsible parties and timelines are included.</p> <p>The update explains how assessment results have influenced decisions or changes in the unit/program, though it may not be exhaustive.</p> <p>At least one action plan in place.</p>	<p>Some action plans for improvement are mentioned, but they may lack detail or specificity.</p> <p>Unit/Program describes some actions taken or planned for improvement in student learning, but the implementation details are vague or not well-defined. Too general; lacking details (e.g., time frame, responsible party, etc.).</p> <p>Not clearly related to assessment results.</p> <p>At least one action plan in place.</p>	<p>All action plans lack detail.</p> <p>No evidence of an action plan for improvement.</p> <p>Not related to assessment results.</p> <p>At least one action plan in place.</p>	<p>No data entered</p>
<p>7. Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle:</p>	<p>Actions from the previous assessment cycle are thoroughly documented, including their detailed description and implementation status.</p> <p>For actions still in progress, the update provides a comprehensive overview of what transpired during the year, the current status of implementation, and a specific timeframe for re-assessment. The description is clear and well-organized.</p>	<p>Actions from the previous assessment cycle are acknowledged and described with reasonable detail, including an update on their implementation status.</p> <p>For actions still in progress, there is a clear indication of what transpired during the year, where the program is in terms of implementation, and a general timeframe for re-assessment.</p>	<p>Some actions from the previous assessment cycle are briefly mentioned, but the details are lacking. There is limited information regarding their implementation status.</p> <p>It is somewhat clear that some actions are still in progress, but the update lacks a comprehensive description of where the program stands in the implementation process or when reassessment is expected.</p>	<p>There is no mention of any actions from the previous assessment cycle. The update is entirely lacking in detail regarding actions, their implementation status, or any plans for reassessment.</p> <p>No information is provided about any action items that are still in progress. There is no insight into the program's current status in implementing these</p>	<p>No data entered</p>

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
	<p>Completed actions are summarized <i>in-depth</i>, and the update elaborates on their significant impact on student learning. It provides a <i>thorough</i> explanation of the changes observed in program assessment results since the action plan's implementation. The information is comprehensive and supports a strong commitment to improvement and accountability.</p>	<p>Completed actions are summarized, and their impact on student learning is <i>briefly</i> expanded upon. The update provides <i>some</i> information about changes in program assessment results since the implementation of the action plan.</p>	<p>For completed actions, there is a basic summary of their impact on student learning, but it lacks depth and detail. The update provides limited insight into any changes observed in program assessment results since the action plan was implemented.</p>	<p>actions, nor when they expect to re-evaluate program-level outcomes. If actions were initiated in the past, there is <i>no</i> reporting on their progress or expected impact. The update <i>does not</i> provide any information about changes or outcomes in the program assessment results since the initiation of the action plan.</p>	
Overall Comment:					
Overall Score (out of 28)					