



QEP Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Indicator	*Factor	Unacceptable (1)	Weak (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)	Comments:
Articulates how the proposed concept addresses a need in the KSU community	Institutional Process	Does not clearly articulate what need is being addressed in the KSU community	Articulates a need, but the relationship to the KSU community is unclear	Clearly articulates how the concept would address a need in the KSU community	Clearly articulates how the concept would address a need in the KSU community with broad and defined benefits	
Describes how the proposal aligns with the KSU mission, vision, and strategic plan	Institutional Process	The proposal neither aligns with nor enhances the KSU mission, vision, and strategic plan	The proposal aligns with, but does not enhance the KSU mission, vision, and strategic plan	The proposal aligns with and somewhat enhances the KSU mission, vision, and strategic plan	The proposal clearly aligns with and enhances the KSU mission, vision, and strategic plan	
Describes how student learning is directly impacted by the proposal	Focus on learning	There is no clear indication that student learning will be impacted by this proposal	Impacts to student learning are limited	A strong case is made that student learning will be directly impacted	A strong case is made that student learning will be directly impacted, and that a large population of students will benefit	
Describes the steps needed for implementing the proposal	Capability	Steps for implementing the proposal are not included	Steps for implementing the proposal are stated, but are not reasonable	A reasonable and viable timeline for implementation of the proposal is included	A reasonable and viable timeline for implementation of the proposal is included, and is clear enough to direct development	



Indicator	*Factor	Unacceptable (1)	Weak (2)	Acceptable (3)	Exceptional (4)	Comments:
Describes the resources needed to implement the proposal	Capability	Description of resources needed to implement the proposal are not present or inadequately addressed	Description of resources needed seem inadequate for implementation of the proposal	Description of resources needed seems adequate for implementation of the proposal	Description of resources needed seems adequate for implementation of the proposal, and are clear enough to formulate a draft budget	
Explains which program(s), area(s), or set(s) of students will be impacted	Broad-Based Involvement	There is no clear identification of which program(s), area(s), or set(s) of students are impacted	Identifies program(s), area(s), or set(s) of students impacted, but the impact is unclear	Identifies all program(s), area(s), and/or set(s) of students impacted	The proposal is interdisciplinary, and provides a clear explanation of which program(s), area(s), and/or set(s) of students are impacted	
Includes an assessment plan with outcomes, assessment methods, and direct measures	Assessment Plan	Does not include outcomes, assessment methods, and measures	Includes outcomes with limited development of assessment methods and measures	Includes outcomes and assessment methods that clearly relate to the outcomes	Includes outcomes, assessment methods, and direct measures that clearly relate to the outcomes	

- Adapted from Georgia Regents University (2014) *Rubric for QEP Proposal*

*The factors above relate back to the framework, found at <http://qep.kennesaw.edu/rubric.php>, and include the components listed below.

Institutional Process – Philosophy, Approach, Institutional Fit

Focus on Learning – Expected QEP Impact/Value-Added, Statement of Intended Outcomes, Appropriate Activities/Interventions

Capability – Manageable Scope of Activities/Interventions, Adequate Resources, Implementation Design

Broad Based Involvement – Campus Understanding, Campus Participation, Interdisciplinary

Assessment Plan – Integral Part of QEP Process, Design, Methods