**  Rubric for Writing/Evaluating the Continuous Improvement Plan Proposal**

|  | Incomplete (0) | Good (1) | Better (2) | Best (3) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mission | No mission statement exists | A mission statement exists | Mission is a statement of the program's purpose and who it serves; Aligned with the college and division mission statements; may need more clarity or precision | OU Mission has clear connection to the institutional mission; clearly states the four components (who, what, why, for whom); clear and concise without complicated language |
| Goals | Unit has no defined goals | Goals have been identified, but it is not clear how/why they were chosen. | Explanation is given to why goals were chosen; evidence for goals is more anecdotal than data-driven; goals demonstrate alignment with RRCC mission and goals | Goals follow explicitly from OU mission; goals have clear connection to institutional goals; goals are based on data, research, or best practices; it is clear what data point the OU hopes to move by accomplishing their goal(s); |
| Data | No evidence that data was used to guide decisions | Data is mentioned, but it is not clear how it informed the goals of the unit | Clear data points have been identified and used for decision making around goals; it isn’t explicitly clear how the goals will help to move the data point | Data has been a focus in the planning process; goals are clearly tied to explicit data points; targets or benchmarks have been established based on comparative data |
| Objectives | No objectives are identified. | Objectives have been established in support of goals | Objectives are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound | Objectives will lead to a path of goal accomplishment, objectives are S.M.A.R.T.; objectives have clearly identified measures and standards for successful completion; objectives use action verbs. |
| Timeline | No evidence that the full cycle of assessment will occur. | Plan for implementation exists but timetable isn’t established | Timetable exists but is unrealistic given staff and time constraints OR timetable is not aggressive enough | Timetable is rigorous and feasible; the full cycle can be completed within the ILEARN cycle; timing of various aspects works with academic calendar and OU resources; timeline isn’t front-loaded or end-loaded |
| Resources/ Budget | No discussion of resources or budget is included | Budget/resource request is included, but relevant explanation/justification is not provided | Budget and explanation of need are included; request is tied specifically to goal(s) or objective(s) | Budget and resource requests demonstrate need; requests are tied to data specific goals/outcomes; alternate methods (low financial need) have been considered; request seems reasonable and feasible; if ongoing request, is tied to ongoing assessment measures |
| Overall Evaluation | There is no formal plan for quality improvement. | The OU relies on short- term planning, such as only looking at the current year when developing goals and objectives. | The OU has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies the methods and techniques for every outcome that will be assessed. | The program has a fully- articulated, sustainable, multi- year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. |

**  Rubric for Writing/Evaluating the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) Summary**

|  | Incomplete (0) | Good (1) | Better (2) | Best (3) – This is where we need to be. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Focus/Problem | No problem has been identified. | There is a general issue stated, but it is unclear where the focus of improvement will be. | Problems are articulated, but it is still unclear what specific issue is going to be addressed over the next three years. | A clear problem (or possibly problems) is/are stated that will be the focus of OU work over the next 3 years. **It is easy for anyone reading it to understand exactly what you are trying to improve.** |
| Strategic Plan | No plan for improvement is identified. | A vague plan is in place, but there are no specific objectives identified. | Objectives are identified, but they don’t have a clear connection to the focus or problem. | Major objectives are laid out that will lead to success for resolving the problem identified by the OU. |
| Data | No evidence that data was used to guide decisions | Reasons are mentioned, but there is no citation of data or research. | Data is included, but not in an easily accessible format (i.e. no tables, graphs, or citations). | Clear data points have been identified and used to establish the need for the continuous improvement plan, including tables and graphs of data, or citations/quotes from research pieces and documents on best practices. |
| Indicators of Success | No outcomes are identified. | Outcomes are identified, but without specific targets. | Outcomes with specific targets are identified, but there is not date set for measurement or evaluation. | Outcomes are identified, and each outcome has a specific target and data for measurement/evaluation. |
| Comparative Data | N/A at this time | N/A at this time | N/A at this time | N/A at this time |
| Conclusions/ Future Actions | N/A at this time | N/A at this time | N/A at this time | N/A at this time |

**Mission Checklist**

* Does it clearly state the four components (who, what, why, for whom)
* Is the statement clear and concise?
* Is it distinctive and memorable?
* Does it clearly state the purpose of the program?
* Does it support the mission of the department and college as a whole?
* Does it reflect the program’s priorities and values?