## Reviewer Rubric

```
Institution: Fairmont State University
College/Department:
Degree Designation (e.g., Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science):
Program/Major (e.g. English, History, Chemistry):
```


## Rubric Scale:

No/Limited Evidence: Limited or no substantive evidence or information is provided.
Some or partial evidence: Some substantive information is provided, but the description, narrative and/or other components are incomplete.
Sufficient evidence: Substantive information and/or narrative is provided on all key components.
N/A: The particular criterion is inappropriate or not applicable to the program under review, the item should be marked N/A.

| Program Mission | No/Limited Evidence (1) | Some/Partial Evidence <br> (2) | Sufficient Evidence (3) | N/A | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The program has established a mission unique to its program that directly aligns with the University mission and Strategic Plan. The mission is made public (e.g., program website, catalog, master course syllabi). |  |  |  |  |  |
| The program contributes to general studies and/or complements, draws upon, and/or supports other programs (e.g., shared facilities, shared faculty, shared courses, general studies). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Score:___ Reviewers Observations, Comments, Questions: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations: |  |  |  |  |  |


| Enrollment Data and Trends | No/Limited <br> Evidence <br> (1) | Some/Partial <br> Evidence <br> (2) | Sufficient <br> Evidence <br> (3) | N/A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Score


| Score____ Reviewers Observations, Comments, Questions: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recommendations: |  |  |  |

## Recommendations:

| Assessment of Student Learning | No/Limited <br> Evidence <br> (1) | Some/Partial <br> Evidence <br> (2) | Sufficient <br> Evidence <br> (3) | N/A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Score

Score Reviewer Observations, Comments, Questions:

## Recommendations:

| Student Success | No/Limited Evidence (1) | Some/Partial Evidence (2) | Sufficient Evidence (3) | N/A | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graduation rates indicate that student complete the program in a timely manner. |  |  |  |  |  |
| High D/F/W courses for the program have been identified and action taken (or to be taken) to address these courses is provided. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provides a brief summary of any relevant trends in program graduation data over the past 5-year cycle. |  |  |  |  |  |
| If program graduate trends are negative, the program identifies the actions that will be taken to address those trends with reference to the data provided (were relevant). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provides a synopsis of student engagement and success in the program (e.g., student research, conference presentations, performances, exhibitions, awards). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Score____ Reviewer Observations, Comments, Questions: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations: |  |  |  |  |  |


| Faculty Contributions and Productivity | No/Limited Evidence (1) | Some/Partial Evidence (2) | Sufficient Evidence (3) | N/A | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The program has the adequate number of full-time faculty needed to meet the mission of the program (teaching, scholarship, service). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program faculty actively engage in professional development, research, and service as evidenced by publications, presentations, and other professional activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program has examples where faculty have been recognized by their professional organization/association/societies or on campus (unit, college, university awards or honors) for their contributions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The programs' faculty have contributed to effective teaching and/or program development (e.g., new course development, new credential, accreditation report author) over the past 5-years. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Score |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reviewer Observations, Comments, Questions: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendations: |  |  |  |  |  |


| Resources | No/Limited Evidence <br> (1) | Some/Partial Evidence <br> (2) | Sufficient Evidence <br> (3) | N/A | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The program's operating budget is sufficient for the needs of the program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provides a summary of facilities (e.g., classrooms, labs) and equipment (e.g., instructional technology, instructional equipment, library holdings) and sufficiency in meeting program needs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The number of faculty are sufficient in number to meet the needs of the program with appropriate teaching loads. If no, the program identified the additional faculty needed and Action Plan(s) for improvement. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicated whether the department was able to support effective teaching and establish effective teaching-learning environments with the existing resources. Identified additional resources the department may need in order to support the program. |  |  |  |  |  |

Score
Reviewer Observations, Comments, Questions:

## Recommendations:

| External Program Demand | No/Limited Evidence (1) | Some/Partial Evidence (2) | Sufficient Evidence (3) | N/A | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The program systematically tracks graduates of the program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program graduates find employment or continue their education. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Score $\qquad$ <br> Reviewer Observations, Comments, Questions: <br> Recommendations: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Review Reflection | No/Limited Evidence (1) | Some/Partial Evidence (2) | Sufficient Evidence (3) | N/A | Score |
| Provides a brief narrative that addresses the previous program review recommendations and the measures taken to address previous program deficiencies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provides a brief narrative that addresses at least three things learned about the program as a result of engaging in the program self-study. |  |  |  |  |  |

Describes an action plan for improving the program. Indicates the applicable
objective, measure and planned implemented change for improvement.

## Score

## Reviewer Observations, Comments, Questions:

## Recommendations:

## Examples of Potential Reviewer questions and/or requests

- Describe the collaborative process undertaken by the unit/program in developing the self-study document and supporting materials.
- Briefly describe the current organizational structure of the academic unit. Discuss any significant changes (e.g., organization, leadership, personnel, programs) since the previous program review.
- Discuss major accomplishments and progress in achieving the program's strategic goals since the previous program review.
- Provide a summary, including dates, of any curricular or programmatic changes since the previous program review and any planned changes. Describe how the use of the assessment findings influenced the curricular or programmatic changes.


## Undergraduate Review Council Final Report

## Name of Academic Department:

## Date of Report

## Names and Departments of Review Team Members:

## Report Summary

A. Introduction: Short introductory paragraph - indicate resources reviewed and individuals or groups interviewed.
B. Program Strengths: Identify strengths of the Department/program (considering viability, curriculum and assessment, students, faculty contributions and productivity, supporting resources, strategic improvement plan etc.).
C. Program Challenges: Identify challenges facing the Department/program (considering at least all areas noted above, where appropriate).
D. Recommendations: Provide recommendations to resolve the challenges and/or to strengthen the Department/program(s). Please consider and organize your recommendations into the two broad categories: (1) Revenue Demanding Recommendation (resources requiring additional funds); and (2) Revenue Neutral Recommendation (no additional funds required). Provide a focused one-sentence statement for each recommendation ("It is recommended that..."). Elaboration of recommendations is not needed since they should be based on information already provided in the report.
E. Interview: Provide a list of interview questions the reviewers may have used in the review.

## Program Review Council Recommendation

The institution is obligated to recommend continuance or discontinuance of a program and to provide a brief rationale for its recommendation:
____1. Continuation of the program at the current level of activity;
____2. Continuation of program with corrective action (for example, reducing the range of optional tracks or merging programs);
3. Identification of the program for further development (for example, providing additional institutional commitment);
4. Development of a cooperative program with another institution, or sharing courses, facilities, faculty, and the like;
5. Discontinuation of the Program

