|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly defined, is in alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Program Purpose:  Program purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative ties the program support and strategic plan together. | Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Strategic Plan:  The program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, the FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are *sufficient* to sustain the program.  The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of the program.  Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The program assessment plan is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program. | The program assessment plan, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The program assessment plan is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook. | The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand. | The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need. | The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | The program clearly demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program demonstrates its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. | The program does not demonstrate its progress made on the G-PIPER and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | The program demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond. | The program demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The program demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or the beyond. | The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The program has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop. | The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The program makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The program makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Intervention Services & Leadership Education (ISLE)  Sport Management | Human Performance Studies  School of Education |  |  |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | ISLE  Human Performance Studies  School of Education  Sport Management |  |  |  |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | Sport Management | ISLE  Human Performance Studies  School of Education |  |  |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | ISLE  Human Performance Studies  School of Education  Sport Management |  |  |  |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | ISLE  Sport Management  School of Education | Human Performance Studies |  |  |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | ISLE  Human Performance Studies  School of Education  Sport Management |  |  |  |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | ISLE  Human Performance Studies  Sport Management | School of Education |  |  |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | ISLE  Sport Management  School of Education | Human Performance Studies |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**  4 | **Meets Expectations**  3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**  2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**  1 |
| **Part 1a Departmental (Program) Purpose & Relationship to University Mission:** Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | **2** | **2** |  |  |
| **Part 1b Departmental (Program) Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of the program to supporting the university strategic plan | **4** |  |  |  |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | **1** | **3** |  |  |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | **4** |  |  |  |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management** | | | | |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program | **3** | **1** |  |  |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Program progress in supporting the G-PIPER and/or SEM Plan | **4** |  |  |  |
| **Part 4.C Program and Faculty Service:** Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond | **3** | **1** |  |  |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | **3** | **1** |  |  |