

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Proposals

Directions: Circle the box that best describes this Institutional Proposal. Write comments and conclusion at the end

Lacking

Emerging

Developed

Highly Developed

A. Setting Institutional Context and Relating the Proposal to the Standards of Accreditation

A. 1. <i>Institutional Context</i>	Vague, generic, unconnected to specifics of the institution	A few references to specific issues; connections unclear; no compelling line of argument; potential negatives avoided	Many/most significant specifics addressed but gaps remain; connections suggested but not fully developed	Lays a firm foundation for why specific issues and approaches are proposed; data exhibits, finances, strengths & challenges, state of SLO assessment, prior Commission actions, etc. directly referenced
A. 2. <i>Self-Review under the Standards</i>	Weak or no connection to the Standards, especially related to learning results and organizational QA; or conversely, compliance-oriented "march through the Standards" with little or no sense of use or relevance to the institution	Some connection to the Standards, but weak in several areas, particularly those related to learning results and organizational QA.	Several key issues arising under Standards are addressed, but learning results, organizational QA, or issues of relevance to the campus (e.g. leadership, finances, enrollment) may be overlooked. Institution describes a systematic process to review itself under the standards but does not provide instrument or results..	Key issues arising under Standards, esp. related to learning results & organizational QA, directly addressed; institution has used the Self-Review Worksheet and/or other methods; instrument & results may be submitted in appendix.
A. 3. <i>Proposal development, leadership involvement</i>	Proposal development is assigned to small number of people, takes place in a vacuum; few signs of broader campus involvement at any level	Proposal development involves "sharing" of drafts but with limited opportunity for input from campus community; leadership provides verbal support but active involvement unclear. Campus is "informed" but does not participate	Proposal development solicits input from a significant portion of campus community but remains with the "usual suspects," does not reach out in creative ways or use proposal as an opportunity to build support for the ongoing self-review	Detailed and persuasive description of how proposal design was developed, how broad support generated, how key leaders (e.g., president, academic VP, faculty leadership) as well as students, student affairs, professional staff, others in campus community involved

B. Framing the review, connecting the CPR & EER

B. 1. <i>Overview, vision, goals of review; how CPR & EER are connected</i>	Proposal presents discrete elements with little or no coherence	The proposal lists elements of the review but vision and basis for coherence must be inferred; outcomes poorly phrased: may be too global, too narrow, or processes rather than products; connection between CPR & EER reflect the assumption that Standards 1 & 3 deal only with capacity, 2 & 4 only with EE.	The proposal describes a fairly coherent vision of the review & cites some specific, substantive outcomes, though others may be processes rather than products. Interconnectedness of entire review as a single process suggested but not fully developed; alignment of CPR and EER largely present; outcomes on p. 36 of 2001 Handbook are largely present but may not be referred to.	The proposal describes a coherent vision of the review & cites specific, substantive outcomes; presents entire review as a single interconnected process; in particular shows alignment of CPR and EER; also cites outcomes on p. 36 of <i>2001 Handbook</i>
B.2. <i>Approach to CPR</i>				
B.2.a. <i>Self-assessment of capacity</i>	Self-assessment not accurate, does not mesh with information publicly available, presented elsewhere in proposal, or in data exhibits. Understanding of connection from CPR to EER missing.	Institution struggles to present an accurate self-assessment, identifies some issues but misses others. Poor understanding of EE issues, their relationship to capacity.	Self-assessment generally accurate, understanding of relationship of CPR to EER good but not fully applied.	Self-assessment accurately identifies key capacity issues overall but especially with regard to supporting EE; looks broadly at resources present or needed: financial but also structures, processes, personnel.
B.2.b. <i>Outcomes of CPR, key indicators, organizational activities</i>	Proposal's selection of issues arbitrary and disjointed. No specifics on priorities, outcomes, indicators, strategies necessary to achieve outcomes. Much confusion, conflation of terms. Preparation for EER seen as sequential rather than simultaneous	Proposal has identified some issues but struggles to be specific about priorities, outcomes, indicators, strategies necessary to achieve outcomes. Much confusion, conflation of terms. Preparation for EER seen as sequential rather than simultaneous	Key issues, outcomes identified, particularly those to support EE; However, the issues may be too numerous or encompassing, risking superficial treatment; or they may be too narrow and/or trivial. Indicators, organization of activities to achieve outcomes may be described in detail but not realistic. There is some sense of where preparation for the EER will be at time of the CPR. Commitment is evident.	Appropriate key issues, outcomes identified, particularly those to support EE; indicators identified, with plans to develop them, if necessary. Organization of activities to achieve outcomes is described in detail. Plan is neither too ambitious nor not ambitious enough. There is a clear sense of where preparation for the EER will be at time of the CPR. Commitment is evident.

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Proposals

Directions: Circle the box that best describes this Institutional Proposal. Write comments and conclusion at the end

	Lacking	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
<i>B.2.c. Relevant CFRs identified</i>	Not at all	Occasionally	Mostly	Fully
<i>B.3. Approach to EER</i>				
<i>B.3.a. Outcomes, systems of quality assurance to be reviewed</i>	Institution is at the "just getting started" stage with assessment of SLOs and/or program review, other quality assurance efforts. Activities that may or may not be relevant are listed in place of outcomes, products.	Institution has spotty assessment and QA systems in place but struggles to move forward, articulate a plan for doing so. Activities are listed in place of outcomes, products.	Proposal cites some specific outcomes for the EER, not merely a list of; issues for which there are outcomes are generally connected to themes, vision of proposal as a whole and efforts for the CPR	Proposal cites specific outcomes for the EER, not merely a list of activities to be undertaken; issues for which there are outcomes are connected to themes, vision of proposal as a whole and efforts for the CPR.
<i>B.3.b. Research questions, methods, key indicators</i>	The proposal is entirely descriptive; it is not written as an inquiry, with hypotheses or questions, a clear methodology, key indicators, or incorporation of good practices. The description may seek to present the institution in the best possible light.	The proposal is largely descriptive; it raises some questions but proposes to answer them through activities rather than findings; though the institution is making an effort, clarity about methodology, key indicators, and accepted good practice is lacking.	The proposal is largely organized as an inquiry, it articulates why the inquiry was structured as it was and how it relates to the CPR and self-review as a whole. Methodologies chosen are generally appropriate to the inquiry. The institution's systems of quality assurance are identified, (e.g., program review, GVAR, capstone courses, portfolio reviews, NSSE, other), The process and findings from inquiry are mostly distinguished; there is commitment to analysis of evidence/ findings, and improvement, but not yet a great deal to show for it.	The proposal is organized as an inquiry, whether couched as research questions to be answered, hypotheses to be proven, phenomena to be investigated, or some other way. The proposal articulates in specific terms why the inquiry was structured as it was and how it relates to the CPR and self-review as a whole. Methodologies chosen are appropriate to the inquiry and enjoy strong faculty buy-in. Institutional systems of quality assurance are identified, (e.g., program review, GVAR, capstone courses, portfolio reviews, NSSE, other), Process and findings are clearly distinguished; there is analysis of evidence/ findings, and a commitment to improvement. Departments, programs and other units on campus are compiling improvement histories.
<i>B.3.c. Current state of SLO assessment, why this approach chosen</i>	There is little or no direct assessment of student learning.	There is direct assessment of student learning in a handful of programs, but no coherent institutional policy or plan.	Specific plans for reviewing and improving student and organizational learning are presented, but as pilots.	Specific plans for reviewing and improving student and organizational learning across the institution are presented. Review of actual student work is integral to the process and approach explained.
<i>B.3.d. Relevant CFRs identified</i>	Not at all	Occasionally	Mostly	Fully
<i>B.3.e. Plans for improving student & organization learning</i>	Program review may be absent or ineffective. Organizational learning as a concept is not referenced. Traditional descriptive and survey data may be collected and cited, but the data are not consistently analyzed and used.	Program review is present but implemented inconsistently. Traditional descriptive and survey data are collected and cited but the data are not consistently analyzed and used.	Program review is present and implemented consistently. Actual student work is reviewed in some areas but not across the institution. Traditional descriptive and survey data are cited and may be selectively analyzed and used.	Program review is present, implemented inconsistently, and includes a focus on student learning. Traditional descriptive and survey data are consistently analyzed and used to complement findings of direct assessment.
<i>B.3.f. Overall plan for entire accreditation review process</i>	Not effective; significant rethinking and revision required	Effectiveness doubtful; significant support, additional work on part of institution required	Effectiveness probable; some assistance may be required	Effectiveness convincing; can serve as a model to other institutions

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Proposals

Directions: Circle the box that best describes this Institutional Proposal. Write comments and conclusion at the end

Lacking

Emerging

Developed

Highly Developed

C. Work plan, engagement of key constituencies

<p><i>C.1. Work plan and milestones</i></p>	<p>Work plan presents only the most basic elements and dates, such as month and year when CPR or EER report must be completed.</p>	<p>Work plan contains some useful detail but needs elaboration.</p>	<p>Proposal indicates in plausible terms how work will be conducted and includes most major elements such as organization, structures, processes, key indicators, and products or milestones. Timeline shows work on EER proceeding simultaneously with CPR</p>	<p>Proposal indicates for each stage how work will be conducted at a high level of specificity, including organization, structures, processes, key indicators, actors, and products or milestones. Timeline shows work on EER proceeding simultaneously with CPR</p>
<p><i>C.2. Data gathering and analysis</i></p>	<p>The institution has only rudimentary data gathering capabilities and vague plans for developing its ability to gather, analyze, and use the data for improvement.</p>	<p>The institution has capabilities sufficient to supply IPEDS data and answer basic questions related to the viability of the institution. It may wish to develop ability to gather, analyze, and use data for improvement but face obstacles (cost, availability of personnel, technology, etc.) Plans to overcome obstacles may or may not be convincing.</p>	<p>The institution has some data gathering and analysis systems in place, and may plan to strengthen them as part of the review. Data are gathered on most programs, and cover most of the following: retention, student learning results, licensure results, job placement, graduate school acceptance rates, and other key data. Data are analyzed holistically but analysis of disaggregated data is the exception. Dissemination and use are limited. A "culture of evidence" is not fully established but will become stronger during the self-review and beyond.</p>	<p>The institution may have extensive data gathering and analysis systems in place, or undertake efforts to create them. Data are gathered on graduate as well as undergraduate programs, and cover retention, student learning results, licensure results, job placement, graduate school acceptance rates, and other key data. Data are analyzed both holistically and in disaggregated form; and disseminated and used to support dialogue, improvement, and a "culture of evidence" across the institution during the self-review and beyond.</p>
<p><i>C.3. Commitment of resources</i></p>	<p>The institution underestimates the resources (financial, human, technological, physical) that will be required to carry out a high-quality self-review. It assumes that much of the work can be carried out by administrators or faculty as part of their routine duties, with only minor investments. It may see the investment as the cost of compliance rather than an investment in its own goals and improved quality.</p>	<p>The institution underestimates the resources (financial, human, technological, physical) that will be required to carry out a high-quality self-review. It is willing to make an investment but does not understand the costs involved. It assumes that much of the work can be carried out by administrators or faculty as an overload with only minor investments. It may not perceive the limitations of its own capital, human or otherwise.</p>	<p>The institution has committed resources to the self-review process and/or has a plan for how to obtain them, but may not have considered all possible needs or figured costs realistically. Resources may not be understood broadly enough as including financial support but also human, technological, and physical resources. The budget may not be linked to goals and priorities but provides a useful beginning point.</p>	<p>The institution has committed resources sufficient to sustain the self-review process and/or has a plan for how to obtain them. Resources are understood broadly as including but not limited to financial support; the necessary human, technological, and physical resources are also factored in. There is a well-developed budget linked to goals and priorities.</p>

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Proposals

Directions: Circle the box that best describes this Institutional Proposal. Write comments and conclusion at the end

Lacking

Emerging

Developed

Highly Developed

D. Appendices

<p><i>D.1. Data exhibits</i></p>	<p>Data exhibits may be incomplete and in incorrect form (i.e. lacking percentages or raw numbers.); data made be out of date or fail to show full 5-year trends. Inventory of EE Indicators and Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation should provide information at the level of detail requested, but there may be little to report. Reference to the data exhibits, especially the Inventory of EE Indicators, is lacking in the main body of the proposal</p>	<p>Data exhibits are mixed in terms of completeness and correctness (i.e. percentages as well as raw numbers.); data may be out of date or fail to show full 5-year trends. Inventory of EE Indicators and Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation provide some information at the level of detail requested. Occasional reference is made to the data exhibits in the main body of the proposal, but issues raised by the data may not be addressed.</p>	<p>Data exhibits are mostly complete and in correct form (i.e. percentages as well as raw numbers.), with the most recent available data and 5-year trends. Inventory of EE Indicators and Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation provide information at the level of detail requested. As appropriate, reference is made to the data exhibits, especially the Inventory of EE Indicators, in the main body of the proposal</p>	<p>Data exhibits are provided fully and in correct form (i.e. percentages as well as raw numbers.), with the most recent available data and showing 5-year trends. Inventory of EE Indicators shows considerable progress on SLOs and evidence gathering, though analysis and use may lag. Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation provides extensive information at the level of detail requested. As appropriate, reference is made to the data exhibits, especially the Inventory of EE Indicators, in the body of the proposal</p>
<p><i>D.2 Off-campus, DE degree prgrams</i></p>	<p>Off-site or distance education degree may or may not be listed. There is no explanation of how evaluation of these programs is incorporated into the self-review.</p>	<p>All degree programs in which 50% or more of the program is offered off-site or by distance learning are listed. There is no explanation, however, of how evaluation of these programs is incorporated into the self-review.</p>	<p>All degree programs in which 50% or more of the program is offered off-site or by distance learning are listed. The appendix explains briefly how evaluation of these programs is incorporated into the self-review.</p>	<p>All degree programs in which 50% or more of the program is offered off-site or by distance learning are listed. The proposal explains (either in the appendix or in the main body of the proposal) in detail how evaluation of these programs is incorporated into the self-review.</p>
<p><i>D.3. Response to prior Commission actions (optional)</i></p>	<p>The proposal fails to respond, either in the main body of the proposal or in the appendix, to earlier Commission recommendations. The proposal may assert that the institution benefited from prior recommendations but fail to provide concrete examples. There is no sign of influence on the current self-review.</p>	<p>The proposal responds, either in the main body of the proposal or in the appendix, to earlier Commission recommendations in very general terms. The proposal may assert that prior recommendations were helpful to the institution, but fail to provide concrete examples. Influence on the current self-review may be minimal or missing.</p>	<p>The proposal responds, either in the main body of the proposal or in the appendix, to earlier Commission recommendations. The response addresses most points, is fairly specific, and may explain how recommendations influenced the current self-review.</p>	<p>The proposal responds, either in the main body of the proposal or in the appendix, to earlier Commission recommendations. The response addresses all points, is specific and complete, and explains, if appropriate, how recommendations influenced the current self-review.</p>