

PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC

Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

| Criterion | Initial | Emerging | Developed | Highly Developed |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Required Elements of the Self-Study | Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes. | Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings. | Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. | Faculty are required to evaluate the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, bench-marking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. |
| Process of Review | Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades. | Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation. | Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts. Departments use the feedback to improve their work. | Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning. |
| Planning and Budgeting | The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes. | The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success. | The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process. | The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments. |
| Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts | No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc. | An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. | A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work. | A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support |
| The Student Experience | Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review. | Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys | The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios, and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it. | Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback. |

Guidelines for Using the Program Review Rubric

For the fullest picture of an institution's accomplishments, reviews of written materials should be augmented with interviews at the time of the visit.

Dimensions of the Rubric:

1. **Self-Study Requirements.** The campus should have explicit requirements for the program's self-study, including an analysis of the program's learning outcomes and a review of the annual assessment studies conducted since the last program review. Faculty preparing the self-study can reflect on the accumulating results and their impact, and plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. As much as possible, programs can benchmark findings against similar programs on other campuses.

Questions: Does the campus require self-studies that include an analysis of the program's learning outcomes, assessment studies, assessment results, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, including the impact of changes made in response to earlier studies? Does the campus require an updated assessment plan for the subsequent years before the next program review?

2. **Self-Study Review.** Internal reviewers (on-campus individuals) and external reviewers (off-campus individuals, usually disciplinary experts) evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact; and they provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement.

Questions: Who reviews the self-studies? Do they have the training or expertise to provide effective feedback? Do they routinely evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do they provide suggestions for improvement? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

3. **Planning and Budgeting.** Program reviews are not be *pro forma* exercises; they should be tied to planning and budgeting processes, with expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates.

Questions: Does the campus systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes? Are expectations established for the impact of planned changes?

4. **Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts.** Institutions often find considerable variation in the quality of assessment efforts across programs. While program reviews encourage departments to reflect on multi-year assessment results, some programs are likely to require more immediate feedback, usually based on a required annual assessment report. This feedback might be provided by an assessment director or committee, relevant dean or others; and whoever has this responsibility should have the expertise to provide quality feedback.

Questions: Does someone or a committee have the responsibility for providing annual feedback on the assessment process? Does this person or team have the expertise to provide effective feedback? Does this person or team routinely provide feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

5. **The Student Experience.** Students have a unique perspective on a given program of study: they know better than anyone what it means to go through it as a student. Program review can take advantage of that perspective and build it into the review.

Questions: Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review? Are they involved in preparations and the self-study? Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback?