

POAR Rubric (2021-22)

Program name **HEALTH & HUMAN PERFORMANCE**

Notes: The reconciled score of each criterion is listed at the end of the rubric along with the comments offered by the reviewers

1. The program's mission statement is clearly aligned with the overall mission of the institution.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

2. The program has developed a sufficient number of goals (objectives) that clearly address the breadth of the program requirements and expectations.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

3. The program has developed a sufficient number of clear and measurable learning outcomes for each goal (objective).

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

4. The program has developed multiple measures of assessment for each learning outcome; measures may be direct/indirect and/or qualitative/quantitative.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

5. The program has developed benchmarks for each assessment technique that are both reasonable and challenging.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

6. The program has collected meaningful data directly related to each learning outcome.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

7. Assessment data have been explicitly used to identify challenges and/or successes resulting in program modifications or "staying the course", respectively.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

8. The assessment process covers the breadth of the student experience and clearly demonstrates the depth of understanding needed to successfully complete the program.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

9. The program's commitment to continuous improvement is clearly demonstrated by the information contained in the assessment plan, findings, and executive summary.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

10. The assessment process used by the program is feasible and does not overload or overburden faculty either collectively or individually.

Strongly Disagree (Not Addressed)

1

2

3

Strongly Agree (Exemplary)

4

5

CRITERION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL
SCORE	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	48

Summary Comments

The program area indicates they are working on more specific evaluation instruments to address certain outcomes and are considering adding specific course embedded assessments which are evidence of data use to inform decision making. There is no evidence of multiple measures for objectives/learning outcomes.

The program is aligned with the mission of the university and the program clearly states multiple clearly stated and relevant goals. Some learning outcomes provide two measures of assessment, yet most only provide a single measure of these measures, many are subjective assessments based on site supervisor evaluation. While these clearly provide external validity, internal direct measures would be beneficial for most outcomes.

The department collects solid data for each measure and uses the information to adjust the state of the program. Several measures are shown to be currently in development, which should provide a multi-dimensional basis for assessment.

The department has clearly stated the intent to develop additional measures to increase the efficacy of the outcome assessment. As such, no changes other than those already stated are recommended at this time.