

Co-Curricular Assessment Plan/Report Scoring Rubric

	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
Student Learning Statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed knowledge, skills, and/or values gained by students in unit experiences • Was student-centered, mission-driven, observable and measurable • Aligned with General Education Goal(s) and Objectives(s) and if applicable, other standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Described a process (what unit does), rather what the student learns • Was not measurable or meaningful to mission • Was incomplete, missing breadth of knowledge, skills, or values
Assessment Techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used multiple direct and indirect measures for some or all; at least one direct per statement • Used valid, reliable, sensitive methods • Used existing operations as possible • Described with sufficient detail for replication • Had specific, clear, appropriate, meaningful targets for achieving the learning statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not connect all statements to associated measures and targets • Used no direct measures • Had questionable, vague, or incomplete measures or targets • Did not seem to capture the “end of experience” effect of the unit
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had complete, unbiased, well-organized findings for the year and trends (if three or more times) • Summarized data appropriately • Provided solid evidence if targets were met • Included supporting documentation (e.g., rubrics), if appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was incomplete or had too much data • Did not clearly align with targets • Was questionable if targets were met • Had questionable data analysis, may “gloss over” data to arrive at desired conclusion
Analysis and Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarized clearly the unit's thoughtful analysis and interpretation of the results • Included decision as to whether targets were met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not clearly summarize the unit's understanding of the results • Did not address if targets were met
Improvement Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified the what to be done, how, for what purpose, by whom, where, by when in the plan • Showed clear, logical connection of results to plan to monitor, correct, or enhance • Identified any assessment that needed to be improved, if shown by findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had actions not clearly related to results • Offered excuses for results, rather than thoughtful interpretation or “next steps” for improvement • Had no or unrealistic improvement plans • Was too general, lacked details • Did not identify responsible person(s)