**University of North Alabama**

**Five-Year Academic Department Review Rubric**

**(Based on the UNA Academic Department Program Review Outline)**

Most requirements will be rated **A** (Adequately Meets Requirement), **P** (Partially Meets Requirement), **N** (Did Not Meet Requirement), or **N/A** (the requirement is not applicable to the department). If the Institutional Effectiveness Committee assesses a requirement with either a **P** or **N**, it must provide, within the comments section, recommendations or suggestions as to how the department may complete/meet the requirement in question. You will notice that some requirements only have two ratings: **Y** (Met Requirement) or **N** (Did Not Meet Requirement).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Assessment | Comments |
| 1. The department assesseditself as it relates to students – enrollment, graduation, studentservices. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 2. The department assesseditself as it relates to faculty and staff activities throughout theprevious reporting period including research, service, and faculty/staff development. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 3. The department assessed itself as it relates to the adequacy of facilities and resources to address the goals and objectives of each program within the department.  |  A P N N/A |  |
| 4. The department adequately indicated its notable achievements |  A P N N/A |  |
| 5. The department adequately responded to previous program review recommendations. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 6. The department adequately articulated its vision and plans for the future |  A P N N/A |  |
| 7. The department’s individual programs were separated and identified for assessment. |  Y N |  |
| 8. The coordinator named for each program is qualified. |  Y N |  |
| 9. The department has a mission statement for every program. |  Y N |  |
| 10. The department provided an adequate overview of each program. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 11. Student learning outcomes were listed for each program. |  Y N |  |
| 12. Program productivity was adequately addressed for each program. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 13. The adequacy of library resources was sufficiently evaluated for each program. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 14. Additional library resource needs were addressed by the department. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 15. Means of assessment for student learning outcomes for each program were indicated. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 16. The results of assessment for all student learning outcomes for each program were summarized. |   A P N N/A |  |
| 17. Recent improvements for each program were adequately identified based upon the results of such assessment(s). |  A P N N/A |  |
| 18. Appropriate documentation was used to support the assessments and improvements made. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 19. Recommendations for improvement were identified for each program. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 20. Program goals for the next five years including, but not limited to, accreditation/re-accreditation, enrollment or expansion, and curriculum, were outlined. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 21. Faculty development goals for the next five year period including new faculty, research, and professional development were outlined for each program. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 22. Recommendations for changes within the control of the program indicated. |  A P N N/A |  |
| 23. Recommendations for changes that require action at the dean, provost, or higher levels indicated. |  A P N N/A |  |