### University of Central Florida Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric (2013-2014 Plans onward)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
<th>Maturing (3)</th>
<th>Accomplished (4)</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One, two, or three</strong> of the Maturing indicators are met.</td>
<td><strong>Four or five</strong> of the Maturing indicators are met.</td>
<td><strong>ALL</strong> of the indicators below (1-6) are met.</td>
<td><strong>ALL</strong> of the Maturing indicators plus at least one of the Accomplished indicators (7 &amp; 8) are met.</td>
<td><strong>ALL</strong> nine indicators are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission statement describes the primary purpose, functions, and stakeholders of the program/unit.</td>
<td>2. Assessment process describes the program or unit's assessment strategy; how that strategy is translated into outcomes and measures; and the process for reviewing, analyzing, and applying assessment data for program/unit improvement.</td>
<td>3. Number of outcomes: • Administrative units: minimum of three outcomes • Graduate academic programs: minimum of three student learning outcomes • Undergraduate academic programs: minimum of eight student learning outcomes that incorporate academic learning compacts</td>
<td>7. The plan explicitly links one or more outcomes or measures to strategic planning.</td>
<td>9. The plan builds on previous assessment by including at least one measure to assess the impact of an implemented change, demonstrating a “closed loop” IE Assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number and type of measures: For the required outcomes per indicator #3 above, a minimum of two appropriate, quantitative measures, at least one of which is a direct measure.</td>
<td>5. Measures for the outcomes that meet the minimum requirements listed in indicator #3 establish specific performance targets</td>
<td>6. Specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.), if not proprietary.</td>
<td><strong>Additional Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If programs or units fail to provide any input, their plan will be evaluated with “No effort (0).”*
University of Central Florida Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric (2013-2014 Plans onward)

Supporting Narrative

1. The mission statement should be specific to the program or unit.

2. The assessment process statement should paint a clear picture of all major aspects of the program or unit’s Institutional Effectiveness Assessment process. This may include a description of how the plan evolves over time and how it produces continuous quality improvement for the program or unit. This narrative should be written for “external” reviewers so that someone not familiar with the program or unit will, after reading this statement, have a good understanding of how the program or unit pursues data-driven continuous quality improvement.

3. IMPORTANT: For academic programs, course grades and/or GPA may NOT be used as the metric for a measure.

4. Indicator 4: What constitutes a “direct measure” is contextually dependent. For academic program plans, a “direct measure” is typically assessment of student learning, while a survey of students’ self-perceived efficacy would be considered an indirect measure. For an administrative unit measuring customer satisfaction, a survey instrument could be a direct measure.

5. For those outcomes and measures that satisfy the minimum requirements (per Indicators 3 and 4) each measure should identify a quantitative variable and establish a specific target outcome. This requirement does not apply to any additional outcomes/measures (beyond the minimum requirements) that a program or unit includes in its plan.

6. Assessment instruments (unless proprietary) should be submitted along with the plan either as attachments or links to online instruments. In the event an instrument is still in development when the plan is submitted, a brief description of the planned instrument along with a timeline for implementation may be attached. When this occurs, the program or unit should attach the final instrument to the subsequent Results Report.

7. Administrative units and academic programs should, whenever feasible, attempt to align one or more elements of an IE Assessment plan with strategic planning. That linkage may be to the UCF Strategic Plan or to supporting strategic plans at any subordinate level.

8. IE Assessment is a formative process. The primary purpose is to collect data that will help identify opportunities for continuous quality improvement. This is best evidenced when baseline data reveal an opportunity for improvement and a “stretch” target is set accordingly. In general, when a target for a measure is 100% or when a measure is written to “maintain” a particular level of performance, it is unlikely that the measure has strong formative potential.

9. Collecting data that will be used to evaluate the impact of an implemented change is central to the IE Assessment process. Measures designed for this purpose are the means to close the IE Assessment loop.