Syracuse University

Functional Unit Assessment and Action Plan Rubric

The Functional Unit Assessment and Action Plan rubric focuses on the quality of success outcomes assessment at Syracuse University. This feedback rubric is not intended to evaluate how well units are performing; rather, it is designed to support staff in meeting expectations to assess unit's operations to enhance the student experience at Syracuse University. Each component of the University's assessment and action plan template is incorporated in the rubric. A sustainability component is provided first, setting the expectation that each unit sustains a well-designed and manageable assessment plan and process to inform decision-making.

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
Sustaining Assessment **Note:** Staff should self-assess and score where their unit is in sustaining a well-designed and manageable assessment and action plan.	No documentation that ongoing assessment activity is occurring.	Expectations for sustaining assessment are partially met.	• One or more success outcomes are examined each academic year and documented through the annual assessment and action plan update. • The entire set of outcomes are assessed over Syracuse University's four-year assessment cycle. • Results are shared, discussed, and analyzed by a subset of staff or by committee. • Assessment processes are a regular part of the unit's functioning to inform decision-making.	"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus: • Results are discussed and actions identified and implemented with the opportunity for all staff members to provide input.	

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
Success Outcomes	Success outcomes are not provided.	Expectations for success outcomes are partially met.	• Staff identify 3-6 clear statements that describe what operational excellence (e.g., efficiency, user experience, communication, fiscal responsibility) means for the unit. • Success outcomes are linked and aligned to the unit level goals/mission statement.	"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus: • All success outcomes are written using active verbs that describe what the unit will accomplish to achieve the unit's goals/mission.	
Measures	Measures are not provided.	Expectations for measures are partially met.	• The unit examines success outcomes using at least one direct measure (e.g., average time, counts, money raised, number of applications, project metrics, and total time.) • The unit uses indirect measures (e.g., stakeholder perceptions gathered through focus groups, interviews, and surveys) to support the information gathered through direct measures.	"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus: • The unit uses more than two direct measures to examine outcomes.	
Target	Criteria are not	Expectations for	• For each measure, the unit establishes a target that	"Meets Expectations" indicator is met. Plus:	

Revised: October 2024

	Not Evident – 1	Developing – 2	Meets Expectations - 3	Exemplary – 4	Score
	provided.	criteria are partially met.	defines the acceptable achievement of the learning/success outcome. • The benchmark for success seems reasonably set to enhance operational success.	• The target include three aspects a level (e.g., prior year metric or benchmark), a subject (staff, report, satisfaction level), and a modifier (percentage increase/decrease, maintained performance or timeframe).	
Results	Specific results, consistent with the target, are not provided.	Expectations for results are partially met.	• Results are consistent with the measures and targets identified for the success outcome. • For each measure, specific results are clearly summarized.	"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus: • The unit examines and compares results over a few years to determine consistency of findings.	
Interpretation	Interpretation of results by the program/unit is not provided.	Expectations for interpretation are partially met.	• The unit's interpretation is consistent with the results. • Interpretations summarizes areas of strength and areas of underperformance. • Interpretations reference previous year(s) results and examine and compare the results to gain insight on the unit's achievement of the outcome.	"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus: • The interpretation goes beyond restating the results; it is a comprehensive and detailed narrative that provides the unit and division leaders with information to guide decision-making, actions, and/or resource allocation.	
Action & Follow-Up	Information about actions is not provided.	Expectations for actions are partially met.	• Based on results and interpretation, the unit identifies and implements actions to enhance the unit's operational success OR determine that an action is not necessary other than to "maintain assessment strategy."	"Meets Expectations" indicators are met. Plus: • Progress updates are provided for each action identified and implemented. • The success outcome is reassessed to determine the impact of the action(s).	

Overall Comments: