

2017-18 Plan Expectations Worksheet

Plan for reporting period: July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018

Plans due by October 6, 2017

Assessment Rating:

- No Effort (0):** None of the indicators are met / department fails to submit an updated plan
- Beginning:** Three or more of the first six expectations have not been met.
- Emerging:** One or two of the first six expectations have not been met.
- Maturing:** All of the first six expectations are met.
- Accomplished:** All of the first six expectations are met plus at least one of seven and eight
- Exemplary:** All nine indicators are met.

- Indicator 1:** Mission statement describes the primary purpose, functions, and stakeholders of the program/unit.
 - The mission statement should be specific to the program or unit.
 - The mission statement is the official Mission Statement of the department and matches the mission statement publicly displayed on the department website. The department director should verify the mission has been reviewed and is current.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

- Indicator 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.
 - 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

Indicator 3: Plan has a minimum of three outcomes (requirement for Administrative Units)

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

Indicator 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.

- 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

Indicator 5: Measures for the outcomes that meet the minimum requirements listed in indicator #3 establish specific performance targets.

- 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

Indicator 6: Specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.), if not proprietary.

- 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

- ❑ **Indicator 7:** The plan explicitly links one or more outcomes or measures to strategic planning.
 - 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

- ❑ **Indicator 8:** The plan clearly focuses on formative assessment to promote continuous quality improvement (e.g., establishes baseline data, sets stretch targets based on past performance, etc.).
 - 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

- ❑ **Indicator 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.
 - 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.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

Other expectations:

- An explanation is provided if a rubric requirement is not met.

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

- Measures contain a background statement giving the history of the measure (success, implemented changes, strategies used, etc.)

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION:

- Grammar and spelling should be reviewed, including inclusiveness language (for example, alphabetize gender pronouns and use “personnel hours” in place of “man hours”).

COMMENTS / DISCUSSION: