Cerro Coso Community College
Rubric for Rating Program Reviews

	Good and Acceptable	**Needs Minor Improvement**	**Needs Much Improvement**
Executive Summary	• Executive Summary concisely and clearly describes program or department's key strengths, areas needing improvement, and actions to be taken.	• Executive Summary describes program or department's key strengths, areas needing improvement, and actions to be taken.	• Executive Summary inadequately describes program or department's key strengths, areas needing improvement, and actions to be taken.
Part 1 – Relevance	• All required sections of this part completely and accurately reflect content in corresponding college documents. • Each section includes discussion about the continued relevance those definitions. • There is depth of analysis that is comparable to the suggested questions for analysis.	• All required sections of this part completely and accurately reflect content in corresponding college documents, with minor differences in content (perhaps referencing an older version). • Each section includes discussion about the continued relevance of those definitions. • The discussion is brief and omits important considerations for analysis.	• Required sections of this part are missing, incomplete, or significantly inaccurate compared to corresponding college documents. • There is a significant lack of discussion about the relevance of those definitions. • There is little to no discussion about relevance.
Part 2 - Appropriateness **Part 3 – Currency**	• Data is complete, accurate, and persuasive. • Descriptions for all sections are well developed with multiple sentences of clear explanation and numerous specific details in support. • There is depth of analysis about appropriateness and currency that is comparable to the suggested questions for analysis.	• Relevant data is presented. • Descriptions are developed with explanation and specific details in support • The discussion about appropriateness and currency is brief and omits important considerations for analysis.	• Data is absent, weak, or irrelevant. • Descriptions are hurried, one-dimensional, or inappropriately brief, or specific details may be lacking. • There is little to no discussion about appropriateness and currency.
Part 4 - Achievement	• SLOs or AUOs are oriented around the final outcome of student learning or the experience of service recipients. Outcomes are measurable.	• SLOs or AUOs are mostly oriented around the final outcome of student learning or the experience of service recipients. Outcomes are mostly measurable.	• SLOs or AUOs are more accurately described as goals or objectives and lack orientation around the final outcome of student learning or experience of service recipients. Outcomes are not measurable.

	• Appropriate assessment tools were used, and the SLO Assessment data is complete, detailed, and convincing. • If gaps were identified, there is deep analysis about why the gaps exist and a clear plan to improve outcomes, including dates of implementation.	• Appropriate assessment tools were used, and the SLO Assessment data is included; information is almost complete and progress toward assessment is ongoing. • If gaps were identified, there is cursory analysis about why the gaps exist and a general plan to improve outcomes, but specifics about plan implementation are lacking.	• Inappropriate assessment tools were used, and SLO Assessment data is missing or unconvincing. • If gaps were identified, there is a significant lack of analysis about why the gaps exist and/or no plan to improve outcomes.
Part 5 - Planning	• Current program strengths and improvements needed are clear and evidence-based and reflect an in-depth discussion within the program with specific examples cited. • There is critical analysis of how student learning outcomes can be improved and how outcomes can be more effectively measured. • SLO/AUP Assessment is the driving force of goal-setting and action plans. • Goals are clearly related to the mission of the program and college; they are clearly stated, a time frame is provided, and assignment of responsibility is evident.	• Current program strengths and improvements needed are based on available evidence. • There is cursory discussion of how student learning outcomes can be improved and how outcomes can be more effectively measured. • Three- and six-year program goals can be traced back to SLO/AUP Assessment data. • Goals reasonably relate to the problems identified; they are satisfactorily stated based on the analysis and evidence cited; they present what needs to be done but may lack precise action plans	• Strengths and weaknesses are not cited or not based on evidence. • There is a lack of analysis of how student learning outcomes can be improved and how outcomes can be more effectively measured. • Three- and six-year program goals cannot reasonably be traced back to SLO/AUP Assessment data. • Goals may be unsupported, incomplete, impractical, or unmeasurable.
Overall Impression	• The document is cogent; all parts work together to produce a coherent vision; improvement of student learning is strongly in evidence throughout. • The document is accessible and easy to read. It is thorough, but also concisely communicated. • It clearly tells a story of what has transpired in the program since the last program review.	• The document is generally acceptable; parts relate to each other, but document feels like an exercise in completion rather than a work plan for improvement of student learning. • The document is fairly accessible and readable. It perhaps overlooks some important issues for analysis. It perhaps is redundant or fluffy in places. • It generally tells a story of what has transpired in the program since the last program review, but could benefit from a few points of clarification.	• The document is unsatisfactory; parts are disunified or incoherent; improvement of student learning is an afterthought; minimal standards of professional work not met. • The document is difficult to read due to redundancy or density of unnecessary content. • There is not a clear story of what has transpired in the program since the last program review.

Program Review Committee Members:

Put a check mark in the appropriate column for each criterion. Refer to the rubric above. Use a separate page for each program review

Program:_____

	Good and Acceptable	Needs Minor Improvement	Needs Major Improvement
Executive Summary			
Part 1 – Relevance			
Part 2 - Appropriateness **Part 3 – Currency**			
Part 4 - Achievement			
Part 5 - Planning			
Overall Impression			

Comments

(Please elaborate on what is needed to improve this Program Review)

Cumulative Scores -

Scoring - Need Average of 2.25 or better

Acceptable = 3 pts
Minor Improvement = 2 pts
Major Improvement = 1 pt

	Acceptable	pts	Minor Impr.	pts	Major Impr.	pts	Total	Average
Executive Summary	xxxxxx	18	x	2			20.0	2.50
Part I - Relevance	xxxxxx	18	x	2			20.0	2.50
Parts II and III - Approp, Currency	xxxxxx	18			xx	2	20.0	2.50
Part IV - Achievement	xxxxx	15	x	2	x	1	18.0	2.25
Part V - Planning	xxx	9	xx	4	xx	2	15.0	1.88
Overall Impression	xxx	9	xxxx	8			17.0	2.13
Total								2.29