

POAR Rubric (2021-22)

Program name **MEd DISTRICT**

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	2	4	2	5	4	3	4	3	5	37

Summary Comments

One goal was included. There are no multiple measures for student learning outcomes. The same statement was used for each outcome regarding utilizing data to make decisions. There is no executive summary or plan to use the data to examine the program. Certification scores were not included, although there is a certification exam, so all assessment are based on grades. Each program goal is aligned with at least two measurable learning outcomes.

The program provides solid measures for learning outcomes and objectives. The department collects quality data and uses it to assess the expectations of the program performance. The new measure for computer proficiency is not listed, but is needed. I would recommend completing this measurement item and

creating the benchmark, but no other recommendations at this time.

The program mission statement is aligned with the university mission. The program goals reflect the mission of the program as well as the university. Program only provides 1 goal of providing candidates with the knowledge to gain certification, yet no independent measures of certificate success rate is given. Only internal subjective measures are used. Program lists 5 learning outcomes for 1 total goal. Only 1 measure of assessment is used for each learning outcome. Each measure used does however show to be aligned with the corresponding section of the National Educational Leadership Prep Program. The assessment items appear to be rigorous and thorough, encompassing the entire program.

The faculty show that the data obtained are used to improve the program as the lowest performing areas are shown to be improving over the last report. Results summary also shows the intent to potential use rubric raw scores rather than percentages. This may allow for the identification of specific points of interest in program improvement and design. The more detailed measure could help to overcome the subjective nature of the internal measures.

Executive summary also suggests that many graduates gain certification, yet no measure is provided for how many, and no benchmark is provided for an expected percentage. With graduates showing to be successful, in light of the current environment, no additional changes are suggested at this time.