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Overview

- UCF institutional effectiveness assessment process
- Evolution of the assessment process
- Rubric development and implementation
- Benefits
UCF Overview

- Basic Carnegie classification: research universities (high research activity)
- UCF also achieved Carnegie Community Engagement Classification
- 2nd largest university in U.S. with 56,337 students
- 1,415 acres on Orlando campus
- 10 regional campuses and numerous other instructional sites
- Extensive distance learning offerings
- 12 colleges, including a medical college
- 216 degree programs (91 bachelor’s, 92 master’s, 3 specialist, 29 doctoral, 1 professional)
Assessment Leadership

- Coordinators
- DRC Members
- UAC
- Provost
- VPs and Deans
- President
Assessment Scope and Schedule

- 355 programs and units report
  - Year round process
  - Centralized online reporting system
  - Ongoing reviews and feedback by DRC

- September – Coordinators submit final results and plans

- October – DRCs review results and plans

- November to December – UAC final review
Integrated Approach

Strategic Planning

IE Assessment

Program or Unit Reviews
Assessment Process: The Dinosaur Era at UCF

- Loads of paper documents
- Manual submission of assessment plans
- No common assessment plan template
- No structured review of plans
- Little faculty and staff involvement
- Difficult to manage or use
Assessment Process: The Middle Ages at UCF

- Establishment of University Assessment Committee
- Creation of an assessment support office
- Formation of a common assessment template in Microsoft Word
- Knowledge management – manually driven
  - Communication by email
  - Electronic submission of assessment plans by email
Cyber Age: Transition to a Knowledge Management System

- Includes more players in the process
- Increases communication
  - promotes best practice
  - institutional memory
- Reduces work load for faculty and staff
  - doers
  - support staff
- Promotes collaboration and mentoring
- Centralized capture of knowledge
- Extract and report information
  - improve process and support
  - meta analysis
Structure and Design of Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Rubrics
## Prior Rating Scales for Plans

### Documentation of Mission, Outcomes, and Measures
- **Complete:** Program has mission statement, a sufficient number of learning and program outcomes, and sufficient measures (usually at least 2) linked to each outcome
- **Partial:** Some parts of the plan do not have sufficient detail (e.g., insufficient number of learning outcomes or measures); or the plan lacks some coherence (e.g., measures not related to outcomes)
- **None:** No assessment plan submitted

### Evaluation of Plan
- **Excellent:** The plan addresses the noted deficiencies in prior data collection, has sufficient detail, and will clearly provide useful data for program improvement. No deficiencies found. This is a model plan
- **Good:** The plan has sufficient detail and will provide useful data for program improvement
- **Acceptable:** The plan lacks sufficient detail, but will provide some limited data that may be useful
- **Unacceptable:** A plan was not submitted or lacks detail to be useful

### Comparison of Plans
- **Maintained Good or Excellent Quality:** Plan is consistent with previous good plan
- **Substantial Improvement:** Current plan is much stronger than prior year’s plan
- **Maintained Acceptable Quality:** Plan is consistent with previous acceptable plan
- **Some Improvement:** Current plan is somewhat stronger than prior plan
- **No Improvement:** Current plan is the same as the prior plan and there is clearly room for improvement
- **Worse:** Current plan appears to be less useful than the prior plan
- **No Prior Plan

### Overall Comments on Outcomes and Measures
This is a good plan. Much of future progress depends on a new exam and a standard for what performance on the exam should be.
## Prior Rating Scales for Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Report on Data Collected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete: Data on all scheduled measures were collected and reports provide details of the results. If the data were not collected, a good explanation is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial: Data on some of the scheduled measures were not collected or reports are not of sufficient detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None: No data collection took place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Report on Implemented and Planned Changes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete: Changes to Plan and/or program checked off, explanations of each change provided, and changes are related to results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial: Recommended actions not linked to results and/or some explanations missing for checked items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None: Implemented and planned changes not addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRC Evaluation of Results Report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: The reporting of data collected, and implemented and planned changes is complete; an excellent example of closing the loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good: The reporting of data collected and implemented and planned changes is complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable: Only partial reporting took place, but the program has addressed the issue in their next plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable: Partial or no reporting and/or actions took place; and no changes to plan are indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintained Good or Excellent Quality: Documentation of data collection and use of results is consistently good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Improvement: Documentation of data collection and use of results is substantially more detailed than prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Improvement: Documentation of data collection and/or use of results is somewhat more complete than prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Improvement: Documentation of data collection and use of results is about the same as prior year and there is clearly room for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse: Documentation of data collection and/or use of results is less detailed and less complete than prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prior results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained Acceptable Quality: Documentation of data collection and use of results indicates the program is on track with no major issues to report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*UCF*
Purpose of Developing New Rubrics

- Achieve clear and consistent rating system
- Deepen collaborative model for reviewers and coordinators
- Enhance the usefulness of the assessment process and deepen quality
- Tie IE assessment with strategic planning
Design and Development of Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Rubrics

- Sub committee of the University Assessment Committee (UAC) was established to develop rubrics
- Drafts circulated to UAC
- Revisions incorporated
- Pilot tested with coordinators and Divisional Review Committee (DRC) members
- Designed feedback survey
- Analyzed feedback survey to improve the content and language of rubrics
### University of Central Florida Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (3)</th>
<th>Accomplished (4)</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three or more</strong> of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are not met.</td>
<td><strong>Up to two</strong> of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are not met.</td>
<td><strong>All of the following indicators are met.</strong></td>
<td><strong>All of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are met and at least one of the additional indicators is met.</strong></td>
<td><strong>All of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are met and all of the additional indicators are met.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission statement includes the following: name of program/unit, purpose, primary functions and activities, and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assessment process is provided and describes assessment strategies, and how the program or unit members are involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 incorporates academic learning compacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minimum of two appropriate measures for each outcome; at least one is a direct measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Measures establish specific, quantifiable performance targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Measures and targets are designed to promote improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.), if not proprietary</th>
<th>8. Outcomes in the plan include stretch targets or include measurement of academic or operational initiatives that resulted from previous assessment</th>
<th>9. Describes the relationship between the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment plan and the University's Strategic Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (3)</th>
<th>Accomplished (4)</th>
<th>Exemplary (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three or more</strong> of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are not met.</td>
<td><strong>Up to two</strong> of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are not met.</td>
<td>All of the following indicators are met.</td>
<td>All of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are met and at least one of the additional indicators is met.</td>
<td>All of the <em>Meets Expectations</em> indicators are met and all of the additional indicators are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Complete and relevant data are provided for all measures OR if data are incomplete or missing, an explanation is provided</td>
<td>2. Data reporting is thorough (see below)</td>
<td><strong>Additional Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Additional Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Results for each measure indicate whether the target for that measure has been met</td>
<td>7. Includes description of how the assessment process has been useful to your program or unit</td>
<td>8. Includes description of how IE Assessment has resulted in quality improvement initiatives</td>
<td>9. Includes description of how IE Assessment has resulted in quality improvement initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reflective statements are provided either for each outcome or aggregated for multiple outcomes</td>
<td>5. Implemented and planned changes are included and are linked to assessment data, or if no changes are reported, an explanation is provided</td>
<td>6. Assessment instruments are attached or linked to if not proprietary</td>
<td>9. Data collection and analysis are used to assess the impact of implemented changes, demonstrating a fully “closed loop” process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *i.e.*, populations are defined; sampling methods and response rates are provided with survey data, etc.

*If programs or units fail to provide any input, their plan will be evaluated with “No effort (0).”
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Implementation of the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Rubrics

- Programmed into an existing assessment web application
- Replaced existing reviewer rating scales in the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment plans and results templates
- Made link in templates to provide easy access to PDF of rubrics for coordinators, DRC members and DRC Chairs (UAC)
Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric

*If programs or units fail to provide any input, their plan will be evaluated with "No effort (0)."

- **Beginning (1)**
- **Emerging (2)**
- **Meets Expectations (3)**
- **Accomplished (4)**
- **Exemplary (5)**

**Indicators**

- 1. Mission statement includes the following: name of program/unit, purpose, primary functions and activities, and stakeholders
- 2. Assessment process is provided and describes assessment strategies, and how the program or unit members are involved
- 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 incorporates academic learning compacts
- 4. Minimum of two appropriate measures for each outcome; at least one is a direct measure
- 5. Measures establish specific, quantifiable performance targets
- 6. Measures and targets are designed to promote improvement

**Additional Indicators**

- 7. Specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.), if not proprietary
- 8. Outcomes in the plan include stretch targets or include measurement of academic or operational initiatives that resulted from previous assessment
Communication Plan and Assessment Rubric Training

- Conducted a series of workshops and training sessions to clarify levels and indicators
- Applied rubrics to actual plans reports and results reports
- Worked toward establishing inter-rater reliability
- Developed rubric reports for university stakeholders to show how programs or support services areas are meeting the expected standards
### Program or Unit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Unit Status</th>
<th>University of Central Florida*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans not approved by the DRC Chair(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan not created</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan in progress</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans submitted to DRC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan review process has begun, but the review has not been approved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of program and unit plans approved by the DRC Chair</strong></td>
<td><strong>355</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of programs and units doing assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>355</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program or Unit Rubric Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Unit Rubric Level</th>
<th>Number of Programs or Units meeting the level</th>
<th>Percentage of Programs or Units meeting the level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numbers and percents are fictitious and are given as an example.*
Benefits of the Rubrics

- Communication tool
  - Sets clear expectations
  - Uses common terminology
  - Offers concise, focused and timely feedback

- Guides self-evaluation
  - Programmed into web application

- Improves accuracy and consistency throughout the assessment process

- Generates meaningful discussion – more involved faculty and staff members
Benefits of the Rubrics (continued)

- Tool to deepen the collaborative model
- Increases channels of communication
- Results in more “off-line” consultations
- Higher attendance of assessment workshops
- University strategic plan linkages integrated into plan rubric
Future Plans

- Continue training and one to one consultations and collaborative work
- Develop library of examples aligned to the rubric levels
- Share reports with trends over time
- Clarify distinction between indicator 7 and 8 on IE assessment results rubric
Contact Information

Continue the conversation:
Dr. Patrice Lancey
Director
patrice.lancey@ucf.edu
Dr. Divya Bhati
Associate Director
divya.bhati@ucf.edu
Operational Excellence and Assessment Support
www.oeas.ucf.edu