Graduate Self-Study Scoring Rubric

I. General Program Information

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

|  |
| --- |
|  |

2. The program's mission statement aligns with the School of Graduate Studies mission.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence
* Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)

3. Program described changes impacting the program since the last review.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No Evidence
* N/A

II. Alignment within the University

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's mission.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

|  |
| --- |
|  |

2. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Strategic Plan.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve and advance the program.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No Evidence

2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No Evidence

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

4. Program faculty, staff, and/or students received special recognitions or awards during the review period.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, complete with a capstone experience.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

|  |
| --- |
|  |

2. Dual-listed courses are described and explain differences between expectations for undergraduate and graduate students.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence
* Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)

3. Changes to the curriculum were described, including the basis for the changes.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

4. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

5. The program provides opportunities for students to engage outside the classroom.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program uploaded an assessment plan that includes student learning outcomes.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

2. The program aligns their student learning outcomes to the Master's Essential Learning Outcomes.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

3. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

4. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

5. The program described the measures/processes they use to assess SLOs, and the criterion for performance.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

6. The program described the results of the assessment data collected (which should align to the measures and processes described in element 4).

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

7. The program described specific actions individuals in the program took, or will take, to make changes to the program based on assessment results.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

1. Program explains fluctuations in enrollment.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

3. Program has strategies to recruit and retain students.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

4. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

5. Program described efforts to engage underrepresented communities.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

6. The program described student composition and whether it was reflective of the diversity of the University.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimal level is justified or supported by examples or data.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

VI. Demand for Graduates

1. Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment of continue their education.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

3. Described efforts to retain and track graduates.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

4. Described unique features of the program that set it apart from other system or regional colleges and universities.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

VII. Resource Availability & Development: Faculty and Staff Resources

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Information on numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff are provided. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

2. Tenure and promotion standards, including post-tenure requirements, reflect faculty and staff ability to advance in rank.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

3. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence
* Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)

4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

VII. Resource Availability & Development: Student Resources

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its graduate student population.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

2. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students, consider the impact they have on the ability to deliver quality instruction and meet the needs of students.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are provided.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

* Sufficient Evidence
* Some/Partial Evidence
* No/Limited Evidence

IX. Reviewer Conclusions

Reviewers will comment on program’s strengths, areas for improvement and suggest recommended actions.

Recommended Result

* Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.
* Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the Audit & Review Committee.
* Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas. Submit progress report(s) addressing the concerns as directed by the Audit & Review Committee. Progress reports must be submitted to the College Dean, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Audit & Review Committee.
* Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.
* Refer to Provost for action. This option is selected if the report is not completed by the date due.