Academic Program Review Rubric

Program:

Criterion	Excellent/Exemplary	Adequate	Needs Improvement	Comments
Program Overview Review	□Very well organized report with a clear and concise narrative that addresses all components of the report. □ Recommendations are reflective of and informed by report context. □Related certificate report is complete and included in the review package.	□Narrative addresses all components of the report and recommendations are reflective of report context. □ All data benchmarks are met.	□Report is incomplete. □Recommendations are presented that are not addressed in the report.	
Program History Purpose Vision	□Program purpose is clearly stated and addresses how it serves students □Program identifies how program activities focus on MC 2020 themes and describes related activities. □Program provides evidence of how it is aligned with MC 2020 Themes and College Mission.	□Program provides evidence of how program's vision is aligned with MC 2020 Themes.	□Program vision is not current and does not relate to or address the MC 2020 themes. □Program did not address how it serves students.	
Program Curriculum	□Curriculum map is complete □Curriculum related questions and changes are addressed in the report and recommendations with expected timeline for completion.	□Curriculum map is complete. □Curriculum related questions and changes are addressed in the report and recommendations.	□Incomplete curriculum map and student learning outcomes and additional questions not properly addressed.	
Program Delivery Strategies and Coordination	□Discussion of OER's, DFW strategies, and or other successful teaching strategies that can be used by other faculty are present.	□Discussion of successful teaching strategies that can used by other faculty are present.	□Information is not clear and does not address teaching strategies that can be used by other faculty.	
Program Models and Best Practices	□Report includes three higher education institutions with clear explanation of why institutions were selected and evidence that findings informed the recommendations where appropriate.	□Report includes three higher education institutions and evidence that findings informed the recommendations where appropriate.	□Report includes higher education institutions and findings are not addressed in report or recommendations.	
Program Advisory Committee	□Evidence that program advisory committee input informs curriculum and programing decision-making. □Advisory boards offers industry expertise to program.	□Advisory committee is formed, meets regularly to review program curricular and offers advice.	□Advisory committee is just forming and has not provided input for program curriculum or industry information.	
Program Articulation Agreements	□Articulations agreements are current and reflective of program curriculum.	□Articulation agreement are reviewed during this process.	□Articulation agreements are not current.	

CAR Academic Program Review: Program Rubric-2016-2017

Program and Student Perspective	□Program has gather data about student perspective of their program. □Program addresses any student concerns in drafting recommendations or and provides an explanation of student responses.	□Student are canvased about the program meeting their educational goals.	□Incomplete student data is provided or anecdotal data is provided and it is not current.	
Program Data **EMSI Data**	□Program has met all data benchmarks. □Enrollments and awards exceed data benchmarks. □EMSI data indicate that jobs available in the metro area. Program positively addresses EMSI data and its effect on their program.	□Program is meeting enrollments and award benchmarks. □ EMSI data is addressed in the report.	□Program is not meeting enrollment and awards data benchmarks. □ EMSI not provided.	
SWOT Analysis	□Completed SWOT analysis is presented. □SWOT analysis challenges and threats are addressed in the recommendations report. □ Challenges address more than resource (faculty and lab) shortage.	□Completed SWOT analysis is presented.	□ SWOT analysis is incomplete. □Challenges are all resources driven.	
External Peer Reviewer Comments' Recommendations	□External peer reviewer was provided draft recommendations and report and evidence of his or her comments are reflected in the final report and recommendations, when warranted. □ External peer reviewer was given specific questions to address that help inform program recommendations.	□External peer reviewer report is provided and recommendations reflect peer reviewer's comments, when warranted.	□There is no peer reviewer report submitted.	
Recommendations and Action Items	□All recommendations are relevant to the report and the current needs of MC students, align with OSVPAA initiatives, and MC 2020 themes. □All Recommendations are relevant and doable within the given five-year period. □Recommendations address budget cost and identify responsible person for recommendations implementation.	□All recommendations are relevant to the report and the current needs of MC students, align with OSVPAA initiatives, and MC 2020 themes.	□Recommendations do not reflect information provided in the report.	