AUBURN MONTGOMERY

Student Learning Outcome Meta-Assessment Rubric

Academic Program:

Your Name:

	ABSENT	INSUFFICIENT	EMERGENT	ACCEPTABLE	EXEMPLARY
Preliminary Information	☐ At least one piece of information is missing or inaccurate in this section.			☐ All information is present and accurate.	
Description	☐ No SLOs were provided, or were not described.	☐ SLOs are provided but read more like goals than outcomes.	☐ The SLOs are mentioned, but lack the necessary details and specificity to fully understand them.	☐ The SLOs are mentioned and described well, but need minor revisions, e.g. unknown acronyms, etc.	☐ The SLOs are mentioned and described at perfect length and clarity.
Why Did You Select This Outcome?	☐ The program's reasons for selecting the outcomes are not provided, or the subheading is non-existent.	☐ The program provides information that doesn't really explain their reasoning for choosing their outcomes.	☐ The program provides some reasons, but they are not student-centered, e.g. the outcome is a component of an external accreditation, etc.	☐ The program provides a sound reasoning for selecting their outcomes, but does not provide any measurable information to back up their arguments.	☐ The program provides clear and urgent needs for selecting their outcomes, and provides measurable information demonstrating those needs for improvement.
AUM Strategic Goal	☐ Connections to AUM's Strategic Plan are not made.			☐ The outcomes are each linked to one section of AUM's Strategic Plan.	
What (Methods)?	☐ The program does not provide any explanation of their assessment methods and tools for any outcome.	☐ The program provides incomplete information about their methods and tools, particularly failing to mention the assignment used for each outcome.	☐ The program provides their assessment methods/tools, but does not provide any detailed explanations about the content or design of the assignments being used.	☐ The program provides their assessment methods/tools and provides some details about the content covered and/or how the assignment is designed, but does not fully do both.	☐ The program provides their assessment methods/tools and fully describes both the content covered and the design of the assignment.
Where?	☐ The courses in which the assessments are being conducted are not included, where applicable.			☐ Both the course numbers and course titles are included for each outcome, where applicable.	
Success Threshold	☐ The program does not identify success thresholds for any of its SLOs.	☐ The program identifies thresholds which are not measurable with data from the corresponding assignment.	☐ The program identifies thresholds that are measurable, but do not feel appropriate (too lofty or too weak).	☐ The program identifies appropriately rigorous and measurable thresholds for each outcome.	☐ The program identifies appropriately rigorous and measurable thresholds for each outcome, and has evidence of adapting their threshold based on their assessment results over time.
Results	☐ The program does not provide all of their assessment results in the report.	☐ The program mentions results for all outcomes in the report, but they do not include the number of students assessed or any measurable data matching the success threshold.	☐ The program provides results for all outcomes, but either fails to provide the number of students assessed or their students' individual scores. Aggregation of the results is acceptable only if it is more detailed than one class average for the assignment.	☐ The program provides detailed results for all SLOs including the number of students assessed and their students' individual scores (or an acceptably detailed aggregation).	☐ The program provides detailed results for all SLOs including the number of students assessed and their students' individual scores (or an acceptably detailed aggregation). Additionally, a rubric from the assignment is provided to give the reviewer more detail about the content and expectations.
Use of Results	☐ The program does not provide any information regarding changes or improvements for at least one outcome.	☐ The program mentions how they will use the results, but does not use the past tense, showing that the changes may be planned, but have not yet occurred.	☐ The program describes changes they've made to some aspect of the program, but does not provide enough specificity about the changes for a reviewer to understand what exactly was changed or how it will improve student outcomes.	☐ The program provides specific information about the changes made to the program, providing a clear link between the results of the assessment and the changes made.	☐ The program provides specific information about the changes made to the program, providing a clear link between the results of the assessment and the changes made. Further, the changes that are made are particularly thoughtful, well-designed, and go above and beyond to try to improve outcomes.

AUBURN
MONTGOMERY

Operational Outcome Meta-Assessment Rubric

Administrative Unit:

Your Name:

	ABSENT	INSUFFICIENT	EMERGENT	ACCEPTABLE	EXEMPLARY
Preliminary Information	☐ At least one of the following is missing or inaccurate; Department, Director/Assessment Coord., Administrative Division, Mission, and Reporting Period.			☐ All information is present and accurate.	
Description	☐ No outcomes were provided, or were not described.	☐ Outcomes are listed, but do not appear to be focused on a major area of need for the unit.	☐ The outcomes are mentioned, but lack the necessary details and specificity to fully understand the goal.	☐ The outcomes are mentioned and described well, but need minor revisions, e.g. unknown acronyms, etc.	☐ The outcomes are mentioned and described at perfect length and clarity.
Why Did You Select This Outcome?	☐ The unit's reasons for selecting the outcomes are not provided, or the subheading is missing.	☐ The unit provides information that doesn't really explain their reasoning for choosing their outcomes.	☐ The unit provides some reasons, but they do not speak to the urgency of the problem, e.g. the outcome is a component of an external accreditation, etc.	☐ The unit provides a sound reasoning for selecting their outcomes, but does not provide any measurable information to back up their arguments.	☐ The unit provides clear and urgent needs for selecting their outcomes, and provides measurable information demonstrating those needs for improvement.
AUM Strategic Goal	☐ Connections to AUM's Strategic Plan are not made.			☐ The outcomes are each linked to at least one section of AUM's Strategic Plan.	
What Will Be Done to Achieve Success?	☐ The unit does not provide any explanation of their assessment methods and tools for any outcome.	☐ The unit provides incomplete information about their methods and tools, particularly failing to illustrate how the actions to be taken will help achieve the goal.	☐ The unit provides their assessment methods/tools, but does not provide any detailed explanations about the activities taking place.	☐ The unit provides their assessment methods/tools and provides details about the planned activities, but needs minor revisions or clarifications.	☐ The unit provides their assessment methods/tools, describes them with sufficient specificity and clarity, and shows a logical connection between the methods and the goal to be achieved.
Definition of a Successful Outcome	☐ The unit does not identify success thresholds for any of its outcomes.	☐ The unit defines thresholds which are not measurable with data, or is not well connected to the activities undertaken.	☐ The unit identifies thresholds that are measurable, but do not feel appropriate (too lofty or too weak).	☐ The unit identifies appropriately rigorous and measurable thresholds for each outcome.	☐ The unit identifies appropriately rigorous and measurable thresholds for each outcome, and has evidence of adapting their threshold based on their assessment results over time.
Results	☐ The unit does not provide assessment results for at least one operational outcome in the report.	☐ The unit mentions results for all outcomes in the report, but they do not include any measurable data matching the success threshold.	☐ The unit provides results for all outcomes, but lacks specificity or data in some areas, or the results do not match the success threshold.	☐ The unit provides detailed results for all outcomes, addressing every aspect of the defined success thresholds.	☐ The unit provides detailed results for all outcomes, addressing every aspect of the defined success thresholds. Additionally, evidence in some form is provided to back up the data and/or the activities completed.
How Did This Outcome Affect Your Processes?	☐ The unit does not provide any information regarding improvements for at least one outcome.	☐ The unit mentions how they will use the results, but does not use the past tense, showing that the changes may be planned, but have not yet occurred.	☐ The unit describes the improvements made, but does not provide enough specificity about the changes to understand the extent to which they've achieved their goals.	☐ The unit provides specific information about the changes made to the program, providing a clear link between the results of the assessment and the changes made.	☐ The unit provides specific information about the changes made, providing a clear link between the results of the assessment and the changes made. Further, the changes that are made are particularly thoughtful, well-designed, and go above and beyond to try to improve outcomes.