

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18

Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.

Unit/Program Name: Ed.S. School Psychology Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Carrie Ball – carrie.ball@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p>
<p><i>Please Note: An alignment supplement is provided on the college assessment Blackboard page to describe in detail how each SLO is assessed by the various measures.</i></p>				
<p>1. Data-based Decision-Making: Candidates apply various assessment methods and interpret results to recommend, design, and evaluate responsive services and programs. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master's Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master's Case: 100% (4/4) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>

<p>2. Consultation and Collaboration: Candidates understand and apply effective strategies for working collaboratively with others. *G1, G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master's Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn rating of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master's Case: 100% (4/4) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>
<p>3. Intervention: Candidates design, implement and evaluate evidence-based services to support socialization, learning, and mental health, as appropriate for the needs of their clients. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master's Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master's Case: 100% (4/4) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% (2/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>
<p>4. Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning: Candidates understand and work effectively within educational systems to</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills.</p>

<p>create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments. *G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>We continue to have concerns that the domain could be assessed with more depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A line item was added to the Ed.S Project rubric this year. • That item will be reviewed, revised as needed, and also added to the Master’s Case Presentation rubric to ensure we are assessing students’ knowledge and skills in this area at multiple time points.
<p>5. Diversity in Development and Learning: Candidates apply evidence-based strategies for working effectively with diverse individuals and groups and advocating for social justice.</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (4/4) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>
<p>6. Research and Program Evaluation: Candidates apply research to practice and use sound research design to guide, monitor, and evaluate their practice.*G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (4/4) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area reflects improvement from previous years’ data, suggesting that our instructional modifications and added support for students were helpful. • This domain will continue to be monitored for stability. • In addition, data from this domain for candidates in the

		Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher. PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.	Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria. PRAXIS II: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.	Ph.D. program reflect a high level of “No Basis” ratings during some field experiences. We plan to work with our field supervisors to ensure this item is appropriately evaluated in the practicum and internship setting, and that candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate applied knowledge in this domain.
7. Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice: Candidates provide integrated and comprehensive services in keeping with legal, ethical, and professional standards. *G1, G2, G3, G4, G5	(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II (2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain. Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain. Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher. Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher. PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria. Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria. Master’s Case: 100% (4/4) candidates met minimum criteria. Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria. PRAXIS II: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.	Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

Discoveries:

- Our candidates perform consistently well and routinely exceed expectations in the areas of Data-based Decision-making, Consultation and Collaboration, and Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice.
- In the areas of Intervention, Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning, and Diversity in Development and Learning, students also consistently meet expectations, but it is unclear that their practicum and internship experiences include significant opportunities to demonstrate these skills. Many evaluation items are rated as “No Basis” and we tend to see *slightly* more variations in performance on PRAXIS-II performance in these domains, though these patterns are not evident in this year’s data. In addition, we previously identified a lack of direct performance indicators (i.e., faculty-evaluated knowledge and skill) in the area of Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning during earlier assessment cycles.
- In the area of Research and Program Evaluation, students historically have demonstrated more difficulty meeting program expectations and getting relevant field experiences.

Evidence of Improvement:

- This year, we have developed and added a “Systems Analysis” element to our Ed.S. project rubric to increase faculty evaluation of candidate knowledge and skill in the area of Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning. Evidence suggests adequate knowledge based on the additional indicator.
- Faculty have worked over the past year to increase our explicit instruction, guided practice, and formative feedback with regard to competencies expected in the Research and Program Evaluation domain. Resulting data reflect improved candidate performance on multiple indicators of knowledge; however, we continue to have concerns about a high rate of “No Basis” ratings from field supervisors.
- During 2017-2018, we worked collaboratively with a team of candidates, faculty, and field supervisors to revise and pilot a new field evaluation form. This demonstrates our response to concerns that the items previously being evaluated in the field were not reflective of the experiences candidates were having and therefore did not accurately reflect their demonstrated knowledge and skills in applied settings. Pilot data and feedback from supervisors reflect a positive response to the revised form (i.e., more relevant, more user-friendly). More information has been provided on the College Assessment Blackboard site.

Focus of Assessment Plan:

- We will review the “Systems Analysis” element from our Ed.S. project rubric, revise if needed, and also add it to our Master’s Case Presentation rubric, to ensure we are assessing this outcome at multiple time points.
- We plan to implement the new field evaluation form in the coming year and examine the data we receive with respect to its consistency with our campus-based assessments and the percentage of “No Basis” ratings. We hope to see an increase in the percentage of items rated and improved consistency in ratings.

Stakeholder Communication:

- Candidates and field supervisors were actively involved in developing the new evaluation form. A meeting with practicum supervisors is planned for November 2018 to share the new assessment form and pilot data.
- At the same meeting, we plan to collaboratively discuss experiences supervisors and faculty expect candidates to have as part of the practicum experience, and how activities might be crafted to cover a broader range of SLO’s. We hope this will partially address our concern about the breadth of field-based experiences.
- We solicit student feedback annually through a student survey; information is communicated from faculty-students through our student organization (Student Affiliates in School Psychology) and through a student liaison who attends and participates in program area meetings.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

The table below reflects our goals for the upcoming year, as our program has not previously participated in this planning process.

a. What goals/objectives have been established to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps will be taken to make progress on each goal and who will be responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?
1. Improve persistence and completion for distance students.	1. Increase consistency in course offerings; reduce unpredictable schedule changes (program faculty). 2. Revise complete training manual for distance students (program coordinator) 3. Require partnering district agreement prior to admission (program coordinator) 4. Propose certificate program to encourage initiation of coursework and increase employment options for students prior to full program enrollment (program faculty)	Our attrition rate for the Ed.S. program is slightly higher for students enrolled in part-time distance study. This is primarily due to barriers posed by required travel to campus and required practicum hours. We hope to reduce these barriers through (a) clearer initial communication, (b) consistency in course times and offerings, (c) assurance of an available and supportive partnering site, and (d) a more flexible option for beginning the sequence of coursework that will allow students to begin working in the field sooner. We will monitor enrollment, persistence, and attrition for part-time and distance students.
2. Improve online course experience.	1. Collect additional feedback from students about their experience with online coursework; use suggestions for strategic course improvement (Alyce Hopple) 2. Program faculty complete ISU-offered Online Instructor Certificate Course (Chavez Phelps)	Our most recent annual student survey indicated students are less satisfied with online courses. These comprise a large number of our research and statistics courses, which cover content our Student Learning Outcome Summary report has historically indicated as an area for improvement. Therefore, we would like to do more investigation. We will ensure our junior faculty work to build their skills in online instruction and will use the additional feedback collected to make more strategic improvement decisions. We will examine annual student survey data again next year to assess for progress.

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

Discoveries: Attending specifically to student retention, persistence, and completion has allowed us to identify one potential source of preventable attrition – our part-time distance students. Although our completion rate remains strong for on-campus and full-time students, we find that students who endeavor to work full-time while completing the program are often less successful in completing all program requirements. This will be our primary focus for programmatic improvements. In addition, reflecting upon student performance led to an interesting potential connection between students’ online course experience and their knowledge and skills in the area of research and program evaluation. Given (a) nearly all research and stats courses are now delivered in online or hybrid format, (b) students recently reported concerns about their online learning experiences, and (c) Research and Program Evaluation has been an SLO in which we have historically identified as an area for growth, these potential connections will be a focus of further investigation.

Impacts: For part-time distance students, we expect that our administrative changes will clarify and make explicit the requirements of graduate study and ensure a supportive partnering district prior to students’ initiation of our full program of study. In addition, we anticipate the graduate certificate will present a useful pathway of program admission that would allow prospective students to acquire a specific set of marketable skills and obtain flexible employment that would allow them to complete the full program requirements more easily. Thus, we have identified a number of preventative steps for improving the success of incoming students. Regarding online courses, we remain in a fact-finding and planning stage. Ultimately, we anticipate that our response to student feedback will result in improved online experiences, increased learning, and deeper knowledge that will advance students’ career readiness.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Carrie,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: EdS School Psychology	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00) Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Mature (2.25/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear outcomes specifically aligned with CGPS outcomes.• Good description and samples of tools used to accompany measures of student learning. Excellent alignment between items in various tools to learning outcomes.• Appropriate use of student N – provides indirect justification of variation in targets for success.• Excellent description of use of prior and current results to influence measures/tools, curriculum, pedagogy, and work with evaluators. It is absolutely clear that findings are assessed to down to the level of student learning outcomes, and it's an advantage that outcomes are assessed across multiple opportunities for student performance.• Fantastic sharing of results and inclusion of faculty in the assessment process.• Clear rationale for selected goals, and excellent selection of action steps and responsible individuals for carrying them out.• Excellent use of learning outcome findings to inform success goal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One opportunity for streamlining pairing this evidence with future CAEP accreditation is to note the alignment between outcomes and standards.• Excellent planning – consider which data you will collect in the future to indicate whether action steps are having the intended impact.

Assessment Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success Scoring Rubric is on the last page for reference only. Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary