**Evaluation Rubric for Initial Submission of the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER) Reports**

**[For use by Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC) Members]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name:** |  | |
| **Name of Program Coordinator(s):** |  | |
| **Reviewed by PARC Members:** |  | |
| **Date of Initial PARC Review** | **Date Resubmission Required (if applicable)** | **Date of Final PARC Approval** |
|  |  |  |

**Academic Degree Program Mission:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No Evidence (0)** | **Needs Improvement (1)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Exemplary (3)** | **Overall Score** |
| No mission is articulated for the program. | General statement of intent of the program. | Statement of the program’s purpose is clear and concise. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* |  |
| No link to institutional mission is evident. | Student focus not evident. | Mission is student-focused. | Demonstrates awareness of current discipline norms. |
|  | Does not demonstrate clear alignment with the institutional mission. | Aligned and consistent with the institutional mission statement. | Evidence of a commitment to internationalization. |
|  | Too general to distinguish the program. | Unique to program. | Evidence of a commitment to leadership development. |
|  | Mission relates to the department/college mission, not degree program. |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |  |

**Summary from Previous Assessment Cycle: (NOTE: *This section not applicable for 2012 review*).**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No Evidence (0)** | **Needs Improvement (1)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Exemplary (3)** | **Score** |
| No summary provided. | No assessment results provided. | Provides assessment results. | In addition to the acceptable criteria: |  |
|  | No analysis of results provided. | Provides analysis of results. | Clear and concise. |
|  | No evidence assessment results were shared. | Provides evidence results were shared and with whom. | Provides information of action plan developed. |
|  | No action plan provided. |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |  |

**Section I: Planning and Implementation**

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s):**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No Evidence (0)** | **Needs Improvement (1)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Exemplary (3)** | **Score** |
| No SLO’s evident. | No alignment with program mission and goals. | Alignment with program mission and goals. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* |  |
| SLO’s are not measurable. | Describe a process rather than a learning outcome. | All program SLO’s (three to five) are listed. | SLO’s reflect depth of learning (complexity and sophistication). |
|  | Incomplete list of program outcomes. | At least two SLO’s are assessed. |  |
|  | SLO’s do not address the cognitive (what students know), affective (what students care about) or psychomotor (performance/skills) outcomes associated with program. | SLO’s do not address the cognitive (what students know), affective (what students care about) or psychomotor (performance/skills) outcomes associated with program. |  |
|  |  | Appropriate for program level (undergraduate, graduate). |  |
|  |  | SLO’s being assessed are identified. |  |  |
| Comments: | | | |  |

**Assessment Methods:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No Evidence (0)** | **Needs Improvement (1)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Exemplary (3)** | **Score** |
| No relationship between outcomes and measures. | Indirect relationship to outcomes. | Each method matches the outcome being assessed. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* |  |
| No measures or criteria are indicated. | Methods are not appropriate for the outcome(s) being measured. | Direct measures of student learning are evident. | More than two SLO’s are assessed using multiple measures. |
|  | Appropriate use of indirect measure; however, direct measures must be included. | At least two outcomes are assessed. |  |
|  | Only one outcome is assessed. The assessment of two outcomes is required. | At least one of the outcomes is assessed through a direct measure. |  |
| Comments: | | | |  |

**Assessment Criteria/Benchmarks:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No Evidence (0)** | **Needs Improvement (1)** | **Meets Expectations (2)** | **Exemplary (3)** | **Score** |
| No criteria/ benchmarks provided. | Criteria are not aligned with measures and/or outcomes. | Criteria are aligned with the measures and outcomes. | *In addition to the acceptable criteria:* |  |
|  | Criteria are too general; not specific or measurable. | Criteria/benchmarks are specific and measurable. |  |
|  | More specific criteria are needed, such as scale categories or values. | Criteria have appropriate time frame for assessment. |  |
|  |  | Criteria/benchmarks are of appropriate program-level rigor. |  |
| Comments: | | | |  |