

Rubric for Review of an Academic Program

(Original borrowed from WASC. Adapted by B. Holzman, SFSU, 10/06 Additions/revisions by C. Ney, Cal Poly SLO 2007 Additions, edits by A. Hafner and C. Haras, and PRS, Cal State LA 2009.)

Name of Program & Date _____

Progress Stage Element	INITIAL (1)	EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)	DEVELOPED (3)	HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)	Score	comments
History, Mission, Goals and Objectives (MGOs) (1.0)	History is incomplete, omitting dates of creation, and modification of programs.	History is incomplete, omitting dates of creation, and modification of some programs.	History is complete, with dates of creation, and modification of programs.	History is complete, with context and dates of creation, and modification of programs.		
	Program has not created MGOs, or MGOs are not unique to the program. MGOs are not aligned with college or university outcomes.	Program has established its own set of MGOs that are somewhat unique to the program, but are not aligned with college or university outcomes.	Program has established its own set of MGOs that are unique to the program and that are somewhat aligned with college and university outcomes.	Program has established its own set of MGOs that are both unique to the program and are aligned with college and university outcomes. In addition, they are stated in a clear, concise fashion.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responses to previous PR recommendations 	Program has not implemented recommendations nor explained why.	Program has implemented some recommendations.	Program has implemented most recommendations.	Program has addressed recommendations or incorporated them into its current five-year plan.		
Presentation and Organization of Program Data (2.0)	Some data are reported but little analysis is evident. Not all required elements are present.	Data are reported and some rudimentary analysis is evident. Most of the required elements are present.	Data are displayed in tabular and graphical forms with analysis of the evident trends. Most of the required elements are present.	Data are displayed in tabular and graphical forms and analyzed in terms of both internal and external forces. The evidence presented is used to develop the 5-Year Plan. All required elements are present.		
Curriculum and Instruction (3.0)	Static, conservative curriculum unreflective of changes in the field. Stand-alone courses are not integrated or reflective of student needs. No capstone/culminating or service learning courses.	Somewhat static curriculum may reflect current practice in the field but is not developmental in design to reflect the needs of students. No capstone/culminating or service learning courses.	Curriculum is mostly reflective of current practice in the discipline. Well-planned program incorporates capstone/culminating service courses, although these are not necessarily integrated into the curriculum.	Innovative, dynamic curriculum is reflective of current practice in the discipline. Well-planned program design reflects students' developmental (pedagogical) needs. Intentionally incorporates capstone/culminating events and service learning courses into the curriculum.		

Progress Stage Element	INITIAL (1)	EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)	DEVELOPED (3)	HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)	Score	comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service and General Education Course Instruction. 	Evidence does not demonstrate that instruction of these courses fulfill the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs.	Evidence demonstrates that instruction of these courses fulfills some of the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs.	Evidence demonstrates that instruction of these courses fulfills most of the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs.	Evidence demonstrates that instruction of these courses fulfills the outcomes and needs of the stakeholder programs.		
Assessment of Student Learning (4.0)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) 	Student learning outcomes vague and not measurable.	Student learning outcomes are specific, measurability unclear.	Student learning outcomes specific to program and measurable.	Student learning outcomes specific to program, detailed, and measurable.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum/Program Mapping 	Courses or experiences listed but there are no links to SLOs.	Courses listed and may be linked to SLOs, but no clear levels of learning defined.	Courses are listed and are linked to SLOs. Clear levels of learning are defined for SLOs at all levels (I, D, M)*. Some mapping evident. Program level outcomes map to college and institutional outcomes.	Courses listed and linked to SLOs. Levels of learning defined for SLOs at all levels (I, D, M)*. Clearly defined curriculum map with defined levels. Program level outcomes map to college and institutional outcomes.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods/Measures 	Methods/measures listed but are vague and not linked to SLOs. Methods not specified.	Methods/measures listed and linked to SLOs. Only indirect measures/methods used (e.g. surveys).	Multiple methods and measures used and linked to SLOs. Assessment at only 1 level of learning. Indirect and direct methods used.	Multiple methods and measures used & linked to outcomes. Assessment performed at all levels (I, D, M)*. Authentic performance-based direct & indirect methods are used.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment Infrastructure 	Assessment is assigned to a core faculty working group. Uses of technology identified. Lack of administrative support. Very little data collection.	Identified faculty committee w/some limited administrative support. Some evidence of data collection. Some use of technology.	Faculty committee and program faculty communicate regularly. Admin support evident and evidence seen of regular data collection. Regular use of technology seen.	Faculty committee & assessment coordinator communicate with program faculty, connect to college and institutional efforts. Admin support evident. Regular data collection. Sophisticated use of technology evident.		

Progress Stage Element	INITIAL (1)	EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)	DEVELOPED (3)	HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)	Score	comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and Publication of Findings 	Some findings are presented, but are unavailable online or inaccessible/vague/not comprehensive. Students are not aware of findings	Findings are explained, but not linked to SLOs or standards. Findings are current, but not accessible online. Some students are aware of findings.	Findings explained and available online, current and accessible and some are linked to SLOs or standards. Some students are aware of findings	Current findings are available online and are linked to SLOs or standards. Graphs are used to displays patterns and trends. Most students are aware of findings.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Findings 	Findings discussed among faculty but no change made in program. No annual reports.	Findings regularly discussed by faculty and issues are identified. Annual reports are sometimes seen.	Findings discussed among faculty, issues are identified and changes are made to program (e.g. pedagogy, courses changed or added) Annual reports seen.	Findings widely disseminated among faculty. Faculty actively use and promote findings and make changes for program improvement. Annual reports consistently show all elements of assessment- especially “closing the loop”.		
Program Faculty Engagement in Educational Performance, Professional Achievement, and Contributions (5.0)	No evidence of instructional excellence is presented	Evidence for instructional excellence is scant	Evidence for instructional excellence, is found for many of the program faculty.	There is a range of evidence for instructional excellence.		
	Program faculty have a meager track record in their record of professional achievement.	A minority of program faculty is engaged in scholarship, research and creative activities as evidenced by their record of professional achievement.	A majority of program faculty is engaged in scholarship, research and creative activities as evidenced by their record of professional achievement and awards.	Campus and professional peers for active engagement in publications and scholarship generally recognize program faculty.		
	Little evidence for participation in shared governance and service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community are weak.	A minority of faculty participate in shared governance and/or provide service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community.	A majority of faculty members participate in shared governance or provide service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community	The whole faculty participates actively in shared governance and provides service to the discipline and contributions to the greater community.		
Faculty Utilization within a Program (5.0)	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline is informed by historical assignments without consideration of evolving curricula.	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by perceived curricular needs, not results of outcomes assessment or a review of peer institutions.	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions or by results of outcomes assessment.	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions, disciplinary trends and results of outcomes assessment.		

Progress Stage Element	INITIAL (1)	EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)	DEVELOPED (3)	HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)	Score	comments
	Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a large fraction of courses across the curriculum.	Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a significant fraction of courses mostly in the lower division.	All upper division/graduate courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field.	All courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified Temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field.		
	There is little or no evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record.	There is little or no evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record.	Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are trained before they can be the instructor of record.	Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are trained before they can be the instructor of record.		
Student Engagement and Learning Experiences (6.0)	Almost no students are involved in high-impact activities (clubs, service learning, research w faculty). Program lacks culminating experience that allows integrative learning.	Very few students are involved in high-impact activities (clubs, service learning, research w faculty). Program lacks culminating experience that allows integrative learning.	Some program students are actively engaged in high-impact activities (clubs, service learning, internships, research with faculty, learning communities). Program has a culminating experience but it may not allow integrative learning.	Large numbers of program students are actively engaged in high-impact activities (service learning, internships, research with faculty, learning communities). Program has a culminating experience that promotes integrative learning.		
Five Year Plan						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Recommendations 	Plan does not discuss recommendations and concerns identified in the PR self-study.	Limited discussion of recommendations and concerns identified in the PR self study	Recommendations and concerns identified in the PR self-study are partially addressed.	Recommendations and concerns identified in the PR self-study are thoroughly addressed.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curricular Changes 	Plan does not address anticipated curricular changes or challenges e.g. emerging developments that may affect program curriculum.	Some attempt is made to address curricular changes or challenges/emerging developments that may affect curriculum.	Specific curricular changes are discussed as they are affected by emerging developments using recent supporting data.	Specific curricular changes are discussed and are based on historical data/evidence. Trends are identified.		

Progress Stage Element	INITIAL (1)	EMERGING: PROGRESS MADE (2)	DEVELOPED (3)	HIGHLY DEVELOPED (4)	Score	comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Factors (including SLOs) 	No student factors discussed in plan. No documented planning in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling, and student retention.	Student factors mentioned but not used to inform planning. Limited planning in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling and student retention is documented.	Some student factors based on trends are described. Preliminary planning in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling and student retention are documented.	Multiple student factors based on trends are described and used in planning. Specific plans in the areas of curriculum, outreach, scheduling and retention are discussed. Inadequately funded programs also show planning to meet students' needs.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources 	No discussion of resource adequacy. No 5-yr planning for resources.	Limited discussion of adequacy of resources; no resource planning for a 5-yr period.	Preliminary analysis of adequacy of resources for 5-yr period. Needs are identified but not based on program priorities or data.	Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-yr period. Identify needs based on program priorities using data.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Plan and Timeline 	No action plan or timeline included.	Partial action plan and brief timeline included.	Preliminary action plan included. May include revised curriculum, timeline for task, person/committee, responsible, and cost).	Full plan includes: specific actions or changes to be taken (e.g. revision of curriculum, timeline for task, person/committee responsible, and cost).		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Issues 	No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development; no planning is evident.	Limited discussion of faculty trends (program development, recruitment, retention) based on anecdotal evidence.	Discussion of faculty trends. Preliminary planning for program development as affected by faculty recruitment/retention/needs.	Explicit planning for program development based on faculty recruitment/retention/needs. Supporting data used in planning.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Utilization within a Program 	No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development; no planning is evident.	Limited discussion of faculty trends (program development, recruitment, retention) based on anecdotal evidence	Discussion of faculty trends. Preliminary planning for program development as affected by faculty recruitment/retention/needs.	Explicit planning for program development based on faculty recruitment/retention/needs. Supporting data used in planning		
	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline is informed by historical assignments without consider-	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by <i>perceived</i> curricular needs, not results of outcomes assessment or a	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions <i>or</i> by results of outcomes assess-	Faculty distribution across the fields of the discipline informed by comparison to peer institutions, disciplinary trends and results of		

	ation of evolving curricula.	review of peer institutions.	ment.	outcomes assessment.		
	Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a large fraction of courses across the curriculum.	Temporary/adjunct faculty teach a significant fraction of courses mostly in the lower division.	All upper division/graduate courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field.	All courses are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty or highly qualified Temporary/adjunct faculty current in the field		
	There is little or no evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record.	There is little or no evidence for training of graduate teaching associates (if utilized) before they can be the instructor of record.	Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are trained before they can be the instructor of record.	Graduate teaching associates (if utilized) are trained before they can be the instructor of record.		
Use of Evidence	No assessment plan in place. Assessment does not occur on regular basis. Findings of assessment are not reviewed or analyzed. No changes are made based on evidence.	An assessment plan is evident, but assessment does not occur on regular basis. Findings are sometimes reviewed. One or two changes have been made to program based on data/evidence.	Assessment plan is in place and assessment occurs somewhat regularly. Findings are reviewed and some changes are made based on evidence. Little evidence that changes lead to improved student learning	Faculty are engaged with continual implementation of the assessment plan. Findings are systematically reviewed and changes are made to program based on data and evidence. There is evidence that changes lead to improved student learning.		
Faculty Involvement in Self-Study	Self-study compiled primarily by program head with limited faculty input. Faculty attitude of PR process is one of compliance.	Broader faculty input, but process is compartmentalized; college administrators provide feedback to process. Culture created by faculty that views PR process as a vehicle for improvement/change.	Full participation of appropriate faculty; process collaborative at department level with engagement of college administrators; culture of “by faculty, for the use of faculty”.	Faculty-driven process; Faculty committee organizes and implements the PR review process; collaborative involvement with College and University administrators; PR process is an integral component of program’s operations. Report is self-reflective.		