

Non Academic Program Review Rubric

	0	1	2	3	4
Mission Statement	Missing	Mission statement poorly written and/or not reflective of the areas overall goals.	Mission statement is generally adequate for purpose. It is not entirely clear the goals of the area and/or they seem inaccurate or incomplete.	Generally well written although may be too short or too long to succinctly describe area goals and objectives.	Very well written mission statement that accurately sums up the goals of the area in a concise manner.
Completed Projects	Missing	Major project details missing or vague. Not clear from project list what was achieved or why. Evaluation of projects is largely missing or inaccurate	Completed project list fairly complete. May not include some major projects that were completed in the area Evaluation of projects is not always thorough or accurate.	Completed project list is largely complete although some minor or contextual information may be missing. List is generally easy to read and concise although some ambiguity may exist. Evaluations are largely accurate and logical.	Completed project list is complete and thorough and reflective of the major work completed in the area List is concise and clear on achievements Evaluation of projects is honest and accurate with statement of next steps.
Outcomes	Missing	Outcomes incomplete or unrepresentative of the areas goals and mission. Major sections missing.	Outcomes reasonably complete. But may not be representative Context information may be inaccurate and/or incomplete. Success criteria may not be fully defined Assessment strategy may be unrealistic or difficult to maintain	Outcomes mostly complete, some minor information missing. Success criteria and assessment strategy look realistic and attainable.	Expertly written outcomes with clearly defined, attainable assessment strategy and assessment criteria. Outcomes look reasonable to assess and will give an excellent indication of area performance.
Assessments	Missing	Assessments incomplete Assessment results may be completely anecdotal Conclusions do not follow on from observations Next steps are illogical or not related to assessment results.	Assessments reasonably complete. Assessments may rely purely on observation/dialog rather than hard evidence. Next steps may not be completely logical based on assessment results	Assessments largely appropriate to outcome and utilize valid assessment methods. Assessment results fairly well-written with good indication of situation.	Well designed and thorough assessments which includes quantitative and qualitative data. Assessments give a good indication of outcome success Logical conclusions and clear plan to address assessment results
Future Projects	Missing	Future projects not well-planned or incomplete. Future projects not clearly based on outcomes assessment or previous project evaluations.	Future projects reasonably appropriate and complete. May miss some obvious areas of work identified through outcomes assessment or previous project evaluation. Activities may be unrealistic or not completely recorded.	Future projects mostly complete and focus on addressing areas of concern. Well written and reasonable list of activities.	Future project list complete with will written rationale and outcomes. Future project list draws heavily on addressing areas of concern Activity list looks is accurate, reasonable and gives a good understanding of what should be achieved by when.
Narrative	Missing	Narrative is largely incomplete and/or inaccurate Does not look consistent with project evaluations, plans or outcomes assessment pieces.	Narrative pieces are generally complete but may be missing important observation. Narrative is fairly consistent with other pieces of the program review.	Narrative piece is , overall, well written and complete. Narrative is derived from other pieces and makes sense.	Expertly written narrative. Narrative is consistent with other pieces and brings together the major threads of the program review in a succinct and easily understood manner.