Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric

Report Sections	In Early Development	Developing	Developed
PART I- Introduction			
General Information	Process is incomplete, no evidence of meetings; self-study compiled primarily by program head or a senior faculty member; little faculty and staff input; no input from students or other stakeholders; no indication of a process for faculty participation. Limited history of the program is provided.	Process is emerging, with evidence of meetings and narrow stakeholder engagement. A history of the program is complete but lacking detail.	Process is complete, with clear evidence of meetings; engagement of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders is broad and collaborative. A complete history of the program is provided.
PART II- Response to Previous Recommendations (N/A if appropriate)			
Response & Implementation	No description of previous APR or recommendations. Program did not address or implement recommendations, nor provide an explanation for not doing so.	Limited description of previous APR and recommendations. Program implemented some recommendations and provides explanations for not addressing all.	A clear description of previous APR recommendations and program level response. Program effectively addressed most, if not all, recommendations or incorporated them into its current 5-year plan.
PART III- Program Description & Analysis			
A. Program Mission Purpose & Goals (MPG)	Overview of program MPG's is incomplete; little or no discussion of mission influence on program structure and decision making and stakeholder activities. Little or no discussion of how program MPG's are communicated to faculty, students and stakeholders. Discussion of relevant current issues is incomplete.	Overview of program MPG's is emerging. Indicators of mission influence on program structure, decision making and stakeholder activities. Limited articulation of MPG's to program faculty, students or stakeholders. Limited discussion of relevant current issues and impact to program.	Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program. Evidence of MPG's influencing program design, decision making and stakeholder. Clear articulation of MPG's to program faculty, students and stakeholders. Clear articulation of relevant current issues and impact to program's mission.
B. Evaluation of the Program	Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan incomplete. Limited discussion of how findings are used to implement change and program improvement.	Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan is complete. Developing discussion of how findings are used to implement change and program improvement.	Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan is complete with clear indicators for measuring program qualify/effectiveness. Uses findings to implement change/program improvement.
C. Faculty	No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development and faculty diversity; no succession planning (recruitment, retention, retirement) is evident.	Emerging discussion of faculty trends; preliminary planning for program development, faculty diversity recruitment and retention.	Explicit planning for program development based on faculty diversity and recruitment/retention needs. Supporting data used in planning.
D. Teaching Evaluations & Faculty Development	Little or no discussion of how teaching evaluations are used for program improvement. Limited discussion of faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Cursory information about faculty grants	Moderate discussion of use of teaching evaluations for program improvement. Emerging discussion of faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Provides information related to faculty grants/awards.	Provides analysis of use of teaching evaluations for program improvement. Provides examples and relevant data related to faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Reports complete information related to faculty grants/awards.

E. Students	No analysis of program enrollment and degree production in the context of program development, capacity and sustainability. No discussion of student diversity and plans to increase student diversity.	Curriculum appears to reflect current practice in the discipline. Uses rudimentary analysis of trends in enrollment and degree production to support program quality and sustainability. Some discussion about student diversity and recruitment planning.	Data about student performance and developmental needs informs program improvement. Well-developed and successful plans for student diversity recruitment, retention and success.
F. Student Services & Career Development	Limited discussion of student support services; little analysis on adequacy of services. Initial discussion of program support and student career development. Incomplete information about scholarly output and student grants/awards. Cursory analysis of student feedback processes.	Emerging discussion of student support services; initial analysis on adequacy of services. Preliminary discussion of program support and career development. General information about scholarly output and student grants/awards. Preliminary analysis of student feedback processes.	Provides strong analysis of student support services and program goals for student career development. Provides complete information about scholarly output and student awards/grants. Thorough analysis of how student feedback is collected and utilized for program improvement.
G. Budget/ Obligations, Tuition and Resource Utilization	Initial data on revenue sources and annual financial obligations related to program operations. Does not identify important contextual factors or extenuating circumstances related to resource planning. Preliminary evaluation of tuition and comparators. Limited discussion of students on faculty grants. Little to no discussion of resources utilized for mission fulfillment.	Preliminary discussion of resources; emerging resource planning or potential new revenue streams for the next 5 years. Identifies needs or sets priorities, but not linked to data. Limited discussion of factors affecting resource planning. Evaluation of tuition and comparator programs. Provides data linked to students on faculty grants. Emerging discussion of resources utilized for mission fulfillment.	Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-year period; uses data to identify program needs, priorities and students on faculty grants. Developed understanding of unique program circumstances affecting resource needs. Informed by comparison and analysis of program tuition to peer universities. Full analysis of resources utilized for mission fulfillment.
PART IV- Supplemental Information (optional)			
	Information provided about the program did not contribute to the reviewers' understanding of the program quality and effectiveness.	Information was relevant, but did not contribute significantly to the reviewers' evaluation of program effectiveness.	Additional information enhanced the discussion of specific actions or changes to be taken in the next 5 years.
PART V- Program Reflection & Analysis			
	Provided limited narrative that addresses what was learned through the self-study.	Emerging narrative about what was learned through the process. Identified key areas for reflection and evaluation.	Strong reflection about self-study and integrated feedback into planning process. Articulates plan for future assessment of program needs and outcomes.
PART VI- Supporting Documentation			
	Some but not all of required supporting documents were provided. Information is limited and somewhat supports the program level goals.	Required supporting documents were provided. Documentation is sufficient and provides relevant information to support program level goals.	All supporting documents were provided and complete. Documentation is well thought out and provides context for program level goals.

Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric

The Committee uses the Academic Program Review Rubric to determine program quality and effectiveness. The rubric describes performance criteria that parallel the Academic Review application with targets for success. The three different levels (In Early Development, Developing, and Developed) convey performance in each evaluation area. Programs should review these criteria so steps can be taken to enhance program quality for the next Academic Program Review cycle, if necessary. Please note, the Committee may determine that academic programs are operating between different performance levels. When this occurs, the program will be awarded a "+" score to indicate they are exceeding in some but not all areas. Additional narrative feedback will be provided to the program.