**UIEC Plan Development Rubric**

**2017-2018**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **3.0**  **Exemplary**  **(Clear focus on program improvement)** | **2.0**  **Acceptable (Meets requirements)** | **1.0**  **Incomplete or Unacceptable (Needs Attention)** |
| 1**. Outcomes** (number, clarity, coverage, usefulness) Will the outcomes support program improvement?) | Each outcome appears to have potential for leading to improvement efforts that are consistent with university and program goals.  **Provide context** A meaningful context or rationale is provided for outcomes. It may be provided in the mission or goals section or as a rationale in the outcomes section.  It is clear whether outcomes focus on areas of special concern or comprehensive coverage of program initiatives.  If a subset of outcomes is addressed as part of a multi-year plan, a schedule for full coverage is provided. | Three outcomes focus clearly on important program issues.  All outcomes are linked appropriately to other plans (univ. strategic plan, core learning outcomes, etc.)  All academic programs must have at least 3 outcomes that focus on student learning.  Academic support programs and student affairs must have at least one outcome that is associated with student learning.  Administrative units must have at least one outcome focused on  improving client satisfaction/service | Outcome statement(s) are missing or do not meet acceptable standards  WEAVE plan for current cycle has not been reviewed and verified by program as appropriate for the year. |
| 2. Measures (number, clarity, quality of description) Will the measures support program improvement efforts? Each measurement appears useful for supporting program improvement efforts. | Each measures appears useful for supporting program improvement efforts,  Where competing approaches to measurement exist, (Ex: std. test vs .rubric) a rationale is provided in the measurement section to explain why the measure was selected rather than other options.  Some outcomes have multiple measures | Measures for at least three outcomes are clear, feasible and consistent with outcomes.  Measurement process is fully & clearly described, e.g., includes measurement instruments, describes when, where, how, who, etc.  If course in which the outcome is being measured is offered in more than one modality (online, hybrid, face to face), the measures should be comparable and results must be shown by delivery format (i.e. online and face to face) and by total (whole).  Rubrics should include assessment dimensions, performance categories, and descriptions of desired performance or product for each performance category. | Measures are missing or do not meet acceptable standards |
| 3.Achievement Targets (number clarity, rigor , usefulness) Will the level of achievement targets support program improvement | Each target is accompanied by a convincing rationale that explains why the specified level of performance is appropriate and how it will support program improvement (Ex: reference to faculty consensus about rigor, external norms, prior findings, etc.).  If changes in ATs are anticipated in coming years, a schedule and rationale for the projections should be included. | Clear achievement targets are set for measures of at least 3 outcomes | Achievement Targets are missing or do not meet acceptable standards |

Rules for scoring assessment plans

Exemplary.................................Two of three scores are Exemplary; none are below Acceptable

Acceptable.................................All scores are Acceptable or above. Unacceptable. One or more scores are below Acceptable

Restart.......................................Plan has been incomplete or unacceptable for two or more consecutive years.