

TABLE THREE
RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING A PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Note: Fractional scores (e.g., 2.7, 3.5, etc.) are acceptable

Area/Component	Initial 1	Emerging 2	Developed 3	Highly Developed 4
A. Mission and Context	Missing or vague mission statement. Fails to link program mission to CBU. Inadequate justification for program existence and/or failure to address program changes since last review. Inadequate analysis.	Functional mission statement; contains abstract language or ideas that are hard to assess but generally linked to CBU mission. Superficial discussion of trends related to program demand. Incomplete discussion of changes since last review. Incomplete analysis.	Good mission statement that is linked to CBU mission. Solid discussion of program trends in higher education. Thorough discussion of changes since last program review. Good analysis.	Well-crafted mission; clear and succinct and visibly linked to CBU mission. Thorough and educated discussion of program trends in higher education. Complete assessment of changes since last program review. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score ____
B. Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications	Missing most or all information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and/or workloads. Teaching effectiveness data missing; failure to address faculty resources or faculty needs. Inadequate analysis.	Includes some information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads. Addresses teaching effectiveness and faculty resources, but an incomplete analysis.	Nearly all information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads is included. Data and analysis of teaching effectiveness provided but not clearly linked to resources/mentoring. Good analysis	All information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads is included. Data and analysis of teaching effectiveness provided, along with thorough discussion of faculty resources and faculty needs. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score ____
C. Student Enrollment and Dynamics	Missing most or all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment missing or incomplete. No mention of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Missing analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Inadequate analysis.	Includes some demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment exists but is incomplete and not evidence-based. Brief mention of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Incomplete analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Incomplete analysis.	Includes nearly all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment is discussed but not exceptionally documented. Thorough discussion of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Good analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Good analysis.	Includes all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment is well-documented and discussed. Thorough discussion of organizations, assistance, and/or services for students with special needs. Thorough and thoughtful analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score ____

Area/Component	Initial 1	Emerging 2	Developed 3	Highly Developed 4
D. Class Size and Academic Opportunities	Missing most or all information on special study options, class size, and/or non-credit courses. Little or no evaluation of how study options and class size impact program quality. Inadequate analysis.	Includes some information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses, but no evidence-based discussion of impact on program quality. Incomplete analysis.	Includes nearly all information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses. Solid discussion of impact on program quality. Good analysis.	Includes all information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses. Evidence-based discussion of impact on program quality. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score _____
E. Curriculum	Incomplete overview of course offerings. No mention of alignment with comparable programs. No curriculum map or discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Little to no assessment of curriculum effectiveness or process used to assess curriculum. Inadequate analysis.	Provides an overview of course offerings and degree requirements with limited references to comparable programs. Incomplete curriculum map and limited discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Limited discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Incomplete analysis.	Provides an overview of course offerings and degree requirements and discusses alignment with comparable programs. Includes a curriculum map and thoughtful discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Good analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Good analysis.	Provides an overview of course offerings and degree requirements and engages in a thorough discussion of how program aligns with comparable programs. Includes a curriculum map and thoughtful discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Excellent analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score _____
F. Assessing Student Learning	Missing most or all required information on student learning assessment. No written plan for continuous assessment. Little or no communication with students about assessment process or results. Inadequate analysis.	Includes some information on student learning assessment, but required planning and results documents are missing. Insufficient communication with students about assessment process or results. Incomplete analysis.	Includes nearly all required information on student learning assessment. Necessary planning and results documents are included. Sufficient communication with students about assessment process or results. Good analysis.	Includes all required information on student learning assessment. Well-developed planning and results documents. Superb communication with students about assessment process or results. Excellent evidence-based analysis.
Comments:				Score _____
G. Faith Integration	Missing most or all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and/or evidence of faith integration among students. No data or evidence provided or discussed. Inadequate analysis.	Includes some information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and evidence of faith integration among students. Limited reference to data or evidence, but an incomplete analysis.	Includes nearly all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and evidence of faith integration among students. Solid data or evidence included and discussed. Good analysis.	Includes all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and faith integration among students. Excellent data or evidence included and discussed. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score _____

Area/Component	Initial 1	Emerging 2	Developed 3	Highly Developed 4
H. Using Student and Constituent Feedback	Missing most or all information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys. No mention of acquiring supervisor assessments. No apparent effort to include students in program review. No discussion of budgetary trends. Inadequate analysis	Some references to information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, but limited or no use of supervisor assessments. Recognition of need to include students in program review, but efforts to date are minimal. Incomplete analysis.	Good discussion of information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, and solid attempt to utilize supervisor assessments. Some processes in place for including students in program review. Good analysis.	Excellent discussion of information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, as well as systems for utilizing supervisor assessments. Systematic processes in place for including students in program review. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score ____
I. Resources and Institutional Capacities	Fail to discuss adequacy of library resources or needs around information literacy. No substantive analysis of efforts toward resource acquisition or evidence-based need for new capacities. No discussion of budget trends. Inadequate analysis.	Minimal discussion of library and information literacy needs. Mention of resources acquired but lacks a thorough analysis of need for new capacities. No meaningful discussion of budgetary trends. Incomplete analysis.	Solid discussion of library and information literacy needs. Good discussion of resources acquired and reasonable analysis of need for new capacities. Budgetary trends are discussed. Good analysis.	Excellent discussion of library and information literacy needs. Thorough discussion of resources acquired and excellent, evidence-based analysis of need for new capacities. Budgetary trends are thoughtfully and thoroughly analyzed. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score ____
Conclusions and Recommended Action Steps	Missing a summary of strengths and weaknesses generated from program review. Goals are ambiguous and action steps are unattainable. Inadequate analysis.	Includes a brief summary of strengths and weaknesses but still superficial. Goals are adequate but not evidence-based and action steps are not clear or attainable. Incomplete analysis.	Includes a thorough discussion of strengths and weaknesses. Goals are reasonable and attainable and action steps make sense. Good analysis.	Excellent and articulate discussion of strengths and weaknesses. Goals are clearly linked to program improvement and are reasonable. Action steps are clear. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Comments:				Score ____
OVERALL	Too much missing or incomplete information makes the report deficient and not ready for submission.	Some additional information and improved analyses are required before submission.	Good report; ready for submission, but not as thorough as it could be.	Excellent report; ready for submission.
Comments:				Score ____

TOTAL SCORE: _____