Program Assessment Review (PAR) Rubric

This rubric evaluates the completeness and quality of program assessment reports. Each category is rated as **Exemplary**, **Good**, **Developing**, or **Needs Improvement**.

Legend

- **Exemplary** — □□ Green
- **Good** — □□ Yellow
- **Developing** — □□ Orange
- **Needs Improvement** — □□ Red

Download the PAR Rubric S25

Program Assessment Review (PAR) Rubric

	Exemplary	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Program Information				
Program Information	All program information sections complete.	Most program information sections complete.	Less than 50% of program information section complete.	Program information not started.
Outcomes				
Learning Outcomes	Three or more distinct learning outcomes are present.	Three or more learning outcomes are present, but additional differentiation may be needed.	A) Fewer than three learning outcomes are present; OR B) Learning outcomes are not distinct.	A) Fewer than three learning outcomes are present; AND B) Learning outcomes are not distinct.

	Exemplary	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Assessment Schedule	All outcomes are assessed within a two-year assessment review cycle (Accreditation and Assessment Office).	All outcomes are assessed within a four-year assessment cycle (Higher Learning Commission).	Most outcomes are assessed within a four-year assessment cycle (Higher Learning Commission).	Fewer than 50% of outcomes are assessed within a four-year assessment cycle (Higher Learning Commission).
Methods				
Outcome-Method Alignment	Clearly defined alignment between the outcome(s) and selected method(s) as described in the report.	Somewhat clearly defined alignment between the outcome(s) and selected method(s) as described in the report.	Alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) is not clear.	No evidence of alignment between outcome(s) and method(s).
Method & Method Type	Method(s) are clear; have face validity for specific purpose and student learning; use both direct and indirect method(s).	Method(s) are clear; have face validity for specific purpose and student learning; use ONLY direct OR indirect method(s).	Method(s) are clear; lack face validity for specific purpose OR student learning; use ONLY direct OR indirect method(s).	Method(s) lack clarity; lack face validity for specific purpose OR student learning; use ONLY direct OR indirect method(s).
Method Target	Clear student-focused target (i.e., rubric percentages by category; overall test and item performance; licensure exam scores; etc.). Rationale for choosing target is articulated (e.g., based on local standards, historical trends, external standards, etc.).	Clear student-focused target; target is not delimited (i.e., lacks rubric percentages by category; overall test and item performance; licensure exam scores; etc.). Rationale for choosing target is articulated (e.g., based on local standards, historical trends, external standards, etc.).	Clear student-focused target; target is not delimited (i.e., lacks rubric percentages by category; overall test and item performance; licensure exam scores; etc.). No rationale for choosing target is articulated (e.g., based on local standards, historical trends, external standards, etc.).	Unclear target OR not student-focused target; target is not delimited (i.e., lacks rubric percentages by category; overall test and item performance; licensure exam scores; etc.). No rationale for choosing target is articulated (e.g., based on local standards, historical trends, external standards, etc.).
Findings				

	Exemplary	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Data Reported (e.g., data collection/method of sampling, item analysis, frequency counts, instrument norming statistics, etc.)	Results presented in a clear, easy to interpret format; explanation of data collection method clearly articulated to include such items as sample size, sampling method and background of students.	Results presented but take some time to find and/or interpret; some information about data collection methodology provided.	Results presented but were not clear or easy to interpret; very little information about data collection methodology provided.	Results are not presented.
Analysis & Reflection	Interpretation of results clearly presented and appropriate based on analysis of the data; if possible, combines analysis of direct and indirect measures.	Interpretation of results is somewhat clear and appropriate based on analysis of the data.	Interpretation of results is unclear or inappropriate based on analysis of the data.	Interpretation of results not reported.
Action Plan	Clearly identifies plans for action based on assessment results, including timeline for implementation and persons responsible for implementation; action plans may include the following scenarios: 1) Target Exceeded—Consider longitudinal data and whether the assessment method should change, 2) Target Met—Continue to monitor over an identified timeline, 3) Target Not Met—Improvement Plan articulated, OR recognition of invalid/unreliable assessment process changes needed.	Evidence of plans for action tied to assessment results, but may not identify a timeline for implementation or persons responsible for implementation and/or all possible scenarios of assessment results.	Evidence of plans for action not clearly tied to assessment results and does not identify a timeline for implementation or all scenarios of assessment results.	Does not specify plans for action based on assessment results.
Personnel	Personnel are listed and more than the assessment leader are involved in the full assessment process. The Process is described.	Personnel are listed and more than the assessment leader are involved in the full assessment process.	The assessment leader is listed.	No personnel are listed.

	Exemplary	Good	Developing	Needs Improvement
Evidence (e.g., raw data, rubrics, meeting minutes, student artifacts (free of all identifying information), etc.)	Sufficient evidence is provided to corroborate all data reported, such as rubrics; spreadsheets with rubric scores; spreadsheets with rubric scores; interrater reliability information; aggregated test/item analysis; test psychometric statistics; disaggregated test/item analysis by groups of students with relevant characteristics; licensure exam scores; surveys; survey results; focus group themes/transcripts; meeting minutes; advisory board feedback or analysis; etc. Evidence is a mixture of direct and indirect measures. This is true for ALL findings.	Supporting evidence provided is linked to data, but partially substantiates data reported and is a mixture of direct and indirect measures; this is true for MOST findings.	The link between finding and supporting evidence is difficult to determine; this is true for SOME findings. There is not a mixture of direct and indirect measures.	No substantiating evidence provided.
Curriculum Mapping				
Completion	All courses map to at least one outcome on the curriculum map; All maps (i.e., University Learning Outcomes, curriculum, accreditation, etc.) are complete within the workspace.	All courses map to at least one outcome on the curriculum map, but no other maps are complete.	The curriculum map is incomplete.	No work appears on the curriculum map.
Assessment Over Time	Assessments appear consistently throughout the curriculum map (some assessments appear in lower-level courses while others appear in upper-level courses).	Assessments appear inconsistently on the curriculum map.	Assessments are concentrated in one area of the program.	Assessments do not appear on the curriculum map.

Revision #2
Created 2025-08-19 16:58:49 UTC by William Murry
Updated 2026-05-19 20:37:19 UTC by William Murry