## External Evaluation and Review Rubrics

### Rubric 1: Criteria for rating Educational Performance for Key Evaluation Questions and Focus Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Excellent** | • Performance is exceptional  
• Highly effective contributing processes  
• Very few gaps or weaknesses  
• Any gaps or weaknesses have no significant impact and are managed very effectively |
| **Good**   | • Performance is generally strong  
• Effective contributing processes  
• Few gaps or weaknesses  
• Gaps and weaknesses have some impact but are mostly managed effectively |
| **Marginal** | • Performance is variable  
• Inconsistent contributing processes  
• Some gaps or weaknesses have some impact, and are not managed effectively |
| **Poor**   | • Performance is unacceptably weak  
• Ineffective contributing processes  
• Significant gaps or weaknesses have significant impact, and are not managed effectively  
• Does not meet minimum expectations or requirements |

### Rubric 2: Criteria for rating Capability in Self-Assessment for Key Evaluation Questions and Focus Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Excellent** | • Self-assessment is exceptional and comprehensive  
• Strong evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities  
• Very few gaps or weaknesses  
• Any gaps and weaknesses have no significant impact and are managed very effectively |
| **Good**   | • Self-assessment is generally strong and comprehensive  
• Evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities  
• Few gaps or weaknesses  
• Gaps or weaknesses have some impact but are mostly managed effectively |
| **Marginal** | • Self-assessment is inconsistent in quality and coverage  
• Limited evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities  
• Some gaps and weaknesses have some impact, and are not managed effectively |
| **Poor**   | • Self-assessment is generally ineffective or weak  
• No or minimal evidence of improved outcomes brought about by self-assessment activities  
• Significant gaps or weaknesses have significant impact, and are not managed effectively  
• Does not meet minimum expectations or requirements |
Rubric 3: Criteria for judgements about organisational-level Educational or ITO Performance

| Highly Confident | • The most important needs of learners and all other stakeholders have been comprehensively met  
|                  | • Highly effective processes have contributed to valued outcomes  
|                  | • No significant gaps or weaknesses  
|                  | • Very strong evidence that performance will continue to be exceptional  
| Confident        | • Many important needs of learners and most other stakeholders are being met  
|                  | • Effective processes contribute to valued outcomes  
|                  | • Gaps or areas of weakness are not serious and are effectively managed  
|                  | • Strong evidence that performance will continue to be consistent and sound  
| Not Yet Confident| • Some important needs of learners and other stakeholders are being met  
|                  | • Some inconsistency in processes that contribute to valued outcomes  
|                  | • Not all gaps or areas of weakness are effectively managed, or evidence of improvement is only partial  
|                  | • Limited evidence that future performance will be consistent and sound  
| Not Confident    | • Several important needs of learners and other stakeholders are not being met, or are only partially met  
|                  | • Significant inconsistency in processes that contribute to valued outcomes  
|                  | • Key gaps or areas of weaknesses are ineffectively managed  
|                  | • Strong indications that future self-assessment may fail to meet minimum expectations  

Rubric 4: Criteria for judgements about Capability in Self-Assessment

| Highly Confident | • Comprehensive, ongoing identification and review of all areas of priority need  
|                  | • Consistently high quality of self-assessment information and processes  
|                  | • Findings are used insightfully to make improvements and achieve valued outcomes  
|                  | • Very strong evidence that exceptional self-assessment will continue to guide and inform performance  
| Confident        | • Effective identification and review of majority of areas of priority need  
|                  | • Generally high quality of self-assessment information and processes  
|                  | • Findings are used to make a range of improvements and achieve valued outcomes  
|                  | • Strong evidence that effective self-assessment will continue to guide and inform performance  
| Not Yet Confident| • Partially effective identification and review of some areas of priority need  
|                  | • Inconsistent quality of self-assessment information and processes  
|                  | • Findings are used to make some improvements and achieve some valued outcomes  
|                  | • Limited evidence that future self-assessment will be used to guide and inform performance  
| Not Confident    | • Largely ineffective identification and review of areas of priority need  
|                  | • Significant weaknesses in the quality of self-assessment information and processes  
|                  | • Findings are not used to make improvements  
|                  | • Strong indications that future performance may fail to meet minimum expectations  