**Program Review Rubric for Self-Study Teams' Contributions**

Program: Date:

Study-Study Team members:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Emerging (1 pt)** | **Developing (2 pts)** | **Proficient (3 pts)** | **Scores & specific**  **comments** |
|  | | | | |
| **Curriculum** | | | | |
| *Alignment with University mission and strategic plan* | Mission statement is present but a description of the program, not a statement of purpose. | Mission statement is present but is not clearly aligned to the University mission and strategic plan. | Mission statement is present and compellingly aligned to the University mission and strategic plan. |  |
| **Program assessments and improvements** | | | | |
| *Learning outcomes, measures, and results* | Faculty have program-level outcomes and measures but have not gathered student learning results for at least one of the past three years. | Faculty have program-level outcomes and an assessment plan, and have gathered student learning results for one or some of the outcomes for one or more of the past three years. | Faculty have program-level outcomes and an assessment plan, and have gathered student learning results for most or all of the outcomes for all three of the past three years. |  |
| *Program improvements based on results* | Faculty have designed one or more improvements; they are not directly connected to direct or indirect student learning results for at least one of the past three years. | Faculty have designed one or more improvements that are compellingly informed by direct or indirect student learning results for one or more of the past three years. | Faculty have implemented multi-faceted program improvements directly informed by a variety of assessment results for all three of the past three years. |  |
| **Strengths and challenges** | | | | |
| *Program strengths* | Analysis is limited and/or unrealistic. | Analysis is clear in some respects and not others; some points are described adequately, others not. | Analysis is comprehensive and realistic. Paragraph descriptions are provided for each point. |  |
| *Opportunities to extend strengths* | Analysis is limited and/or unrealistic. | Analysis is clear in some respects and not others; some points are described adequately, others not. | Analysis is comprehensive and realistic. Paragraph descriptions are provided for each point. |  |
| *Program challenges* | Analysis is limited and/or unrealistic. | Analysis is clear in some respects and not others; some points are described adequately, others not. | Analysis is comprehensive and realistic. Paragraph descriptions are provided for each point. |  |
| *Plans for overcoming challenges* | Plans are limited and/or unrealistic. Timeframes are not provided. | Plans address some challenges and not others; some timeframes are provided. | Plans are comprehensive and realistic; appropriate timeframes are provided. |  |
| *Improvements addressed through additional resources* | Requests are unclear and/or unrealistic. | Requests are specific and realistic in some areas, and others not. | Requests are comprehensive and realistic; details for each request are clearly spelled out. |  |
| **Action plan** | | | | |
| *Action steps with timeline to program challenges* | Action steps partially align, or do not align at all, to identified challenges. Details are not specified. | Some action steps align to identified challenges, but others not. Details about timeline and persons responsible are provided, others not. | Action steps are clearly described, address challenges identified, and include realistic timeline and persons responsible for each step. |  |
| **Overall score & comments** ( \_\_\_ of 27 possible pts; AVE = \_\_\_\_\_; 0 = no evidence) | | | | |