Rubric for the Evaluation of Program Reviews

Point Loma Nazarene University

DEPARTMENT LEVEL ANALYSIS					
Criteria	**Initial**	**Emerging**	**Developed**	**Highly Developed**	**Comments**
A. Introduction	Requires significant attention to context(s). Perfunctory statements and generalizations.	Requires a more developed discussion of context(s) for the self-study.	Context(s) are meaningful and relevant to the self-study.	Detailed, comprehensive, yet concise introduction provides meaningful context(s) framing the self-study.	
B. Alignment with Mission	Mission alignment is unclear, or the departmental mission itself is absent.	Departmental and university mission statements are present. Needs more explicit connections in terms of alignment.	Departmental and university mission statements are aligned and described as such.	Departmental and university mission statements are dynamically aligned. Insightful analysis elucidates their relationship.	
C. Quality, Qualification, and Productivity of Department Faculty	Sparse analysis of the faculty instructional workload data. Gaps in responses with regard to faculty quality, qualification, and productivity.	Analysis could yield stronger conclusions with regard to the faculty instructional workload data. Summaries of faculty quality, qualification, and productivity could use more detail.	Analysis provides insights on faculty instructional workload data. Clear summaries of faculty quality, qualification, and productivity.	Detailed, comprehensive analysis of faculty instructional workload data in tandem with discussions of faculty quality, qualification, and productivity.	
D. Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review	Perfunctory attention to recommendations, or sparse allusions to prior program review and recommendations.	Requires attention to progress and/or more thoughtful reflection on recommendations.	Discussion reflects on progress ensuing from prior program review's recommendations.	Discussion provides detailed, comprehensive, yet succinct reflection on progress ensuing from prior program review's recommendations.	
E. General Education and Service Classes	Missing or perfunctory GE assessment data and/or analysis.	Requires attention to interpreting the GE assessment data via curricular and	Analysis of GE assessment data reflects on curricular and pedagogical strengths	Analysis of GE assessment data provides well-supported, sequentially listed, detailed analysis on	

| | | pedagogical lenses. | and/or need for adjustments. | curricular & pedagogical strengths and/or need for adjustments. | |

PROGRAM LEVEL ANALYSIS					
Criteria	**Initial**	**Emerging**	**Developed**	**Highly Developed**	**Comments**
AF1. Trend & Financial Analysis	Insufficient responses. Deflects or dismisses the data provided.	Analysis could use more detail, evidence, or elaboration.	Analysis provides supported, logical conclusions.	Analysis is comprehensively and accurately data-informed, producing sound, rational conclusions.	
BF2. Findings from Assessment	Insufficient responses. Lack of clarity on assessment practices and/or findings. Missing information.	Some gaps in longitudinal data and/or other assessment-related information. Recommendations could use more support.	Accurately addresses assessment-related practices and findings. No gaps in data. Recommendations are supported.	Thorough analysis of longitudinal data, DQP-related assessment, and stakeholder feedback data. No gaps in data. Rational recommendations for adjustments.	
CF3. Curriculum Analysis	Insufficient responses. Missing information.	Analysis could use more detail, evidence, or elaboration.	Analysis provides adequately supported conclusions.	Thorough analysis of comparator institutions or guild standards, employability, and pedagogy leads to sound, rational conclusions.	
DF4. Potential Impact of National Trends	Insufficient responses. Deflects or dismisses data on national trends.	Responses are not wholly data-informed or evidential.	Responses are data-informed. Conclusions are evidential.	Multiple responses are informed by detailed and relevant data, producing a variety of significant and useful conclusions rationally supported by evidence.	
EF5. Quality Markers	Insufficient data analysis or sparse responses disconnected from the data. Missing data.	Data requires more attention in responses. Stronger connections to supporting evidence necessary.	Data-informed responses summon useful evidence for conclusions.	Thorough and comprehensive data-informed responses lead to thoughtful conclusions based on the evidence.	

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed	Comments
FF6. Infrastructure and Staffing	Conclusions about resources needs are hyperbolic and/or not evidence-informed.	Conclusions about resources needs would benefit from stronger connections to evidence and/or data analysis.	Conclusions about resources needs are supported by evidence and data analysis.	Conclusions about resources needs are logically and persuasively informed by supporting evidence and data analysis.	
GF7. Challenges and Opportunities	Insufficient or inappropriate response.	Response partly mirrors the content of F1-F6, not challenges and opportunities beyond those addressed.	Summarizes challenges and opportunities beyond those addressed in F1-F6.	Thoughtful and detailed reflection on challenges and opportunities beyond those addressed in F1-F6.	
HF8. Recommendations for Program Improvement	Relationships between the recommendations and self-study are not clearly evident. Rationale for the list is sparse, or list is unclear.	Recommendations could use stronger connections to self-study analysis.	Recommendations are supported by a rationale ensuing from the self-study.	Detailed and significant recommendations derive logically from the self-study. Each recommendation on the list is strongly supported by a succinct rationale.	

DEPARTMENT LEVEL SYNTHESIS					
Criteria	**Initial**	**Emerging**	**Developed**	**Highly Developed**	**Comments**
AG. Synthesis of Program Recommendations	Combined list of recommendations is incomplete. Synthesis, priorities, and/or rationale are insufficient or missing.	Combined list of recommendations is nearly sufficient. Some rankings could use more elucidation.	Combined list of recommendations is complete. Overall synthesis, rankings, and rationale are clear.	Detailed and significant recommendations derive clearly and logically from the self-study. Each recommendation on the list is strongly supported by a succinct rationale.	
BH. Action Plan Considerations for MOU	Action Plan not clearly related to other parts of MOU, i.e. timeline and financial requests. Dean was not consulted.	Action Plan timeline or financial requests could use fine-tuning in consultation with the dean.	Action Plan is complete. Composed in consensus with the dean.	Action Plan is lucidly presented and complete. Composed in consensus with the dean.	

DEAN LEVEL					
Criteria	**Initial**	**Emerging**	**Developed**	**Highly Developed**	**Comments**
Compliance Checklist	Incomplete and/or grossly inaccurate. Untimeliness delayed submission of self-study.	Signs of hastiness, i.e. inaccuracies or lack of clarity. Significant delay in completion.	Majority of the information is accurate. Completed in a timely manner.	All criteria completed with accuracy and clarity in a timely manner.	
SUPPORTING MATERIALS					
Criteria	**Initial**	**Emerging**	**Developed**	**Highly Developed**	**Comments**
Evidence and/or Exhibits	Missing, mislabeled, or disorganized. Lack of adequate evidence. Disconnected from self-study analysis and conclusions.	Evidence is not quite sufficient in quality and quantity. Some difficulty in navigating the exhibits.	Evidence is sufficient in quality and quantity for supporting the self-study's analysis and conclusions.	Well-organized evidence is comprehensive, relevant, and detailed in quality and quantity. Supports narrative analysis, data-informed decision-making, and conclusions.	
EXTERNAL REVIEW					
Criteria	**Initial**	**Emerging**	**Developed**	**Highly Developed**	**Comments**
Quality of External Review	Reviewer's comments are not logically evident or practically useful. Quixotic, bizarre, or perfunctory responses. Frequent inaccuracies of fact.	Reviewer's comments lack clarity at times. Vagueness may indicate a partial or shallow reading of the self-study.	Reviewer's comments provide useful insights that adequately address issues discussed in the self-study.	Reviewer's comments balance the pragmatic and aspirational. Constructive insights for quality assurance and continuous improvement. Coherently encompasses the self-study's scope.	
Program Response to External Review	Program response deflects, dismisses, or denigrates reviewer's comments. Requires further reflection and/or more objective analysis.	Program response could use more elaboration. Not all aspects of the external reviewer's comments are addressed.	Program response addresses the essential content of the external reviewer's comments.	Program response thoughtfully considers the external reviewer's comments at depth and extrapolates accordingly.	

Version 9.23.2016 * TO TEACH * TO SHAPE * TO SEND * ISAIAH 62 *