

### Administrative Review and Assessment Rubric

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>No Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Part One: Overview and Mission</b>	Well written narrative, clear and concise that describes mission, functions, and impact of services to the College. Lists unit goals, aligns with MC 2020, and provides detailed specifics regarding current status on unit's initiatives related to goals and MC 2020. Organizational chart is provided.	Well written narrative describes mission, functions, and impact of services to the College. Lists unit goals, aligns with MC 2020, and provides current status on unit's initiatives related to goals and MC 2020.	Narrative describes mission and functions. Lists unit goals, aligns with MC 2020, and provides unit's initiatives related to goals and MC 2020.	Mission and goals not clearly stated. No linkage to goals and MC 2020 strategic themes and there is no evidence of status related to any unit initiatives.	
<b>Part Two: Effectiveness of Services</b>	At least two goals were used in this section. The goal, outcome, tool/measure, benchmark, results and next steps are clearly defined and meaningful to the unit. Evidence of the 'Next Steps' in part two are included in the recommendations.	At least two goals were used in this section. The goal, outcome, tool/measure, benchmark, results and next steps are defined. Evidence of the 'Next Steps' in part two are included in the recommendations.	At least two goals were used in this section. Some of components of this section are defined. Evidence of the 'Next Steps' in part two are not included in the recommendations.	Effectiveness of services section is incomplete.	
<b>Part Three: Benchmarking of Services</b>	Three peer institutions were contacted and institution and contact information is provided. Comparative service question is relevant and meaningful and identified. Findings are clearly articulated. 'Next Steps' from this section are expressed in the recommendations.	Three peer institutions were contacted and institution and contact information is provided. Comparative service question is identified. Findings are articulated. 'Next Steps' from this section are expressed in the recommendations.	Three peer institutions were contacted and institution and contact information is provided. Comparative service question is identified. 'Next Steps' findings are not in the recommendations.	Benchmarking services section was incomplete.	

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>No Evidence</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Part Four: Cost and Resources</b>	Information is clear and reasonable. The costs and resource needs of the unit are stated with relevant justifications.	Information is clear. The costs and resource needs of the unit are stated with relevant justifications.	Information is not clear and reasonable. The needs of the unit are stated with justifications.	Sufficient information is not provided.	
<b>Part Five : SWOT Analysis</b>	Evidence that analysis is a culmination of information from prior sections (parts one-four). Analysis includes full scope of the unit's responsibilities.	Evidence that analysis is a culmination of information from prior sections (parts one-four).	Evidence that analysis is result of information provided in the report.	Analysis was not related to other parts of the report and did not seem to inform the recommendations.	
<b>Part Six: Recommendations and Future Actions</b>	All recommendations are based on the report's findings and areas of deficiencies are targeted for improvements with budget estimates, applicable rationale, identified responsible person, and timelines. It is clear that information from parts one-five of the report have informed the recommendations. Recommendations are written in outcomes language and implementable within five year review cycle.	Some recommendations are based on the report's finding and areas of deficiencies are targeted for improvements with budget estimates, applicable rationale, identified responsible person, and timelines. Recommendations are written in outcomes language and implementable within five year review cycle.	Recommendations are linked to areas of deficiencies and are targeted for improvements with budget estimates, rationale, identified responsible person, but are not linked to parts one-five.	Recommendations are incomplete.	

Sources:

Canada College, Redwood City, CA: Administrative Unit Program Review Assessment Rubric

Arizona Western College, Yuma Arizona: Academic Program Review Rubric