

RUBRICS USED TO MEASURE PROGRAM OUTCOMES #1, 2, &3:

PROGRAM OUTCOME #1: JOHN JOHNSON SAMPLE FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENT

Students will demonstrate, through a written exam, their comprehension of the mandatory topics.

Dimensions	0 Missing or Poor	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 Good
Demonstrates comprehension of mandatory topics	Less than 35 out of 50 questions answered correctly	Between 35-39 questions answered correctly	Between 40-44 questions answered correctly	Between 45-50 questions answered correctly

PROGRAM OUTCOME #2: Students will be able to analyze complex factual situations using the important concepts and theories of the Human Resources Development field to help diagnose best practices, problems, and opportunities for program development.

Dimensions	0 Missing or Poor	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 Good
Applies relevant theories in the analysis of the facts of the case	Never applied any theories relevant to contracting.	Explains contracting but applies only the most rudimentary understanding of the model to the analysis of the facts of the case. Understanding of the <i>implications</i> of effective contracting to the organizational development process is missing	Able to see some implications of effective OD contracting in this case (i.e., “don’t take the client’s statement of the problem as gospel”). Missed other implications such as that the contracting process involves creating a consultant-client “partnership” with clear roles for each party	Applied all or the most relevant aspects of the contracting model to the facts of the case: Importance of written agreement. Spelling-out of client-consultant roles. Consultant as process expert. Inadequacy of problem as presented by client. Importance of consultant exploration of client goals and expectations
Supports conclusions with relevant facts	Never supported claims and conclusions with relevant facts	Occasionally supported claims and conclusions with relevant facts: For example, concluded that Henry might be “jumping the gun” in promoting education of managers on high performance work systems and self-managed work teams.	Often supported claims and conclusions with relevant facts. For example, when discussing the importance of client education about the OD process actually listed some of the questions the consultant should be asking Or mentioned that contracting process should reveal gaps in potential agreement among relevant parties (CEO and Union President were not aligned)	Usually or always supported claims and conclusions with relevant facts. When making a statement about contracting usually followed it up with concrete examples or instances from the Johnson Engine case.

Program Outcome #3a: Students will be able to integrate theories and models to develop solutions to complex human resource development problems.

Dimensions	0 Missing or Poor	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 Good
Synthesizes or integrates multiple concepts	<p>Never synthesized or integrated any concepts, or the synthesis was poor.</p> <p>Might juxtapose concepts from two different organization development models – Team Building and Diagnosis, for example – but fail to derive new insights from that juxtaposition.</p>	<p>Synthesized or integrated different concepts in a manner that showed a low level of insight.</p> <p>As an example, discussion of Process Consultation issues in Johnson Engine’s Organizational Transformation process were related to the overall effectiveness of the Action Research Approach. Action Research is addressed as a more step-by-step approach.</p>	<p>Synthesized or integrated different concepts in a manner that showed a moderate level of insight.</p> <p>For example, “the effective implementation of change depends upon and is commensurate with measurement and mid-course correction in the Action Research Process. The insight might be that without the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data, the change leaders could assume they are having the desired impact – change toward increased team behaviors – when, in fact, they are not.</p>	<p>Synthesized or integrated different concepts in a manner that showed a high level of insight.</p> <p>In the case of Johnson Engine, realizing and stating that coaching of managers, executives, and union leadership is essential to the proliferation of a team-based culture is a high level of insight. They realize that change leaders who have been conditioned to a bureaucratic culture may have difficulty letting go of old, bureaucratic attitudes and behaviors, to replace them with new ones, no matter what their conscious intentions might be.</p>
Generates solutions to problems	<p>Never proposed any solutions to the problem of organizational transformation at Johnson Engine or the solutions were poor</p>	<p>Proposed solutions that attempted to address one or more of the important problems, but the proposed solution(s) had significant deficiencies.</p> <p>For example, mentioned that the “union and management leaders had to get together” but failed to suggest how.</p>	<p>Proposed solutions that addressed the most important problems, but at least one solution was unlikely to be effective and/or failed to address key issues.</p> <p>Addressed the need for a change methodology, the importance of diagnosis and measuring readiness for change, paying attention to the process as well as the steps of organization development, etc., but in at least one case, failed to solve the problem. For example, the answer discusses the need to determine readiness for change but fails to suggest what to do if the measure indicates low readiness for change.</p>	<p>Proposed solutions that effectively addressed all or most of the important problems.</p> <p>Bureaucratic Culture. Adversarial Labor Relations. Untrained Managers and Supervisors. No knowledge of how to transform the organization. Culture that emphasizes individuals. Lack of vision in the organization.</p>

Program Outcome #3b: They will demonstrate the effectiveness of their Organizational Development interventions using either quantitative or qualitative evaluation criteria (or both).

Dimensions	0 Missing or Poor	1 Low	2 Moderate	3 Good
Use of quantitative or qualitative measures to determine OD project effectiveness	Fails to mention measurement or glosses over the question by writing something fairly obvious such as, "measurement of effectiveness is important in OD."	<p>May explain why it's important to track effectiveness of OD interventions but doesn't apply this knowledge to the case</p> <p>Knows that without feedback on effectiveness of intervention(s), clients have no way of knowing what, specifically, has improved. Doesn't go beyond that.</p>	<p>Able to discuss why one or two particular sets of measures might be important in demonstrating OD intervention(s) effectiveness in XYZ's transformation from bureaucracy to high performance work system.</p> <p>For example, the organization might want to show the difference between productivity in work teams before and after transition to self-managed work teams.</p> <p>Another example might be to give a culture survey at the beginning of the OD intervention, and then give it again after a series of culture change events (Grid OD, creation of a new organization vision) had occurred.</p> <p>Other examples are possible</p>	<p>Able to explain how specific measurement results might lead to modification of OD approach or specific OD interventions to improve impact</p> <p>Culture Survey, for example, might show that attitudes between union and management employees had not changed significantly after 6 months of intergroup team building. This would suggest that factors other than lack of teamwork might be involved. Perhaps key union employees were still not involved in important decision making or certain leaders were only appearing to "get with the program". Such results might suggest the need for collecting additional diagnostic data from both union and management employees, using both interviews (qualitative methods) and questionnaires (qualitative methods).</p> <p>Other answers are possible, but all should explain how the results led to a change in the OD approach.</p>

