Readiness Review Guidelines

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS

In order to be able to assess each performance indicator according to the program shortcomings (D, W, and C) (if any), the evaluation judgment of each performance indicator is carried out by the aid of rubrics specially designed for this purpose.

EVALUATION JUDGMENT

The program readiness review worksheet summarizes the initial evaluation judgments of each program being considered for accreditation and/or extension of accreditation. It summarizes the identification of shortcomings with respect to criteria. Shortcomings are shown as a **Deficiency (D)**, **Weakness (W)**, or **Concern (C)**. If no shortcomings are identified the program is considered to be in **Compliance to criteria (Y)**. Sometimes suggestions (**Observations**) are offered to assist compliant programs in its continuous improvement (O). The evaluation judgment of each performance indicator is carried out by the aid of rubrics specially designed for this purpose (See the attached guide).

Deficiency (D):

A deficiency indicates that a criterion, policy or procedure is not satisfied. Therefore, the program is not in compliance with the criterion, policy, or procedure.

Weakness (W):

A weakness indicates that a program lacks enough strength of compliance with a criterion, policy or procedure in a way that ensures that the quality of the program will not be compromised. Therefore, remedial action is required to strengthen compliance with the criterion, policy or procedure prior to the next review.

Concern (C):

A concern indicates that a program currently satisfies a criterion, policy, or procedure; however, the potential exists for the situation to change such that the criterion, policy, or procedure may not be satisfied.

Observation (O):

An observation is a comment or suggestion that does not relate directly to the current accreditation action but is offered to assist the institution in its continuing efforts to improve its programs.

Readiness Review Worksheet

Caidonian 1. CTIDENTO	Head of Dept.	,	Reviewer
Criterion 1: STUDENTS	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
1.1 Student Admissions			
1.2 Evaluating Student Performance			
1.3 Transfer Students and Transfer Courses			
1.4 Advising and Career Guidance			
1.5 Work instead of Courses			
1.6 Graduation Requirements			
1.7 Records of Student Work/Transcripts			

Critarian 1. Dragram Educational Objectives	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 2: Program Educational Objectives	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
2.1 Mission Statement			
2.2 Program Educational Objectives			
2.3 Consistency of the Program Educational Objectives with the Mission of the Institution			
2.4 Program Constituencies			
2.5 Process for Review of the Program Educational Objectives			

Caritarian 2. Ctardont Outanna	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 3: Student Outcomes	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
3.1 Process for the Establishment and Revision of the			
Student Outcomes			
3.2 Student Outcomes			
3.3 Mapping of Student Outcomes to Criterion 3			
Requirements for Student Outcomes			

Critorian A. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 4: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
4.1 Documentation of Processes			
4.2 Student Outcome Assessment and Methods			
4.3 Assessment Schedule and Frequency			
4.4 Evaluation			
4.5 Using Results of Assessment and Evaluation for Continuous Improvement Actions			
4.6 Using Other Input for Continuous Improvement			

Cuitarian 5. Currianlum	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 5: Curriculum	D, W or Y	D , W , C , O or Y	Comments
5.1 Program Curriculum			
5.2 Course syllabus			
5.3 Educational Unit			
5.4 Credit Unit			
5.5 Advisory Committee			

Cuitarian (a Faculty	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 6: Faculty	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
6.1 Faculty Qualifications			
6.2 Faculty Workload			
6.3 Faculty Size			
6.4 Professional Development			
6.5 Authority and Responsibility of Faculty			

Criterion 7: Facilities	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 7: Facilities	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
7.1 Offices, Classrooms and Laboratories			
7.2 Computing Resources			
7.3 Guidance			
7.4 Maintenance and Upgrading of Facilities			
7.5 Library Services			
7.6 Overall Comments on Facilities			

Cuitanian O. Institutional Comment	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
Criterion 8: Institutional Support	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
8.1 Leadership			
8.2 Program Budget and Financial Support			
8.3 Staffing			
8.4 Faculty Hiring and Retention			
8.5 Support of Faculty Professional Development			
8.6 Academic Support Units			
8.7 Non-academic Support Units			

Specific Program Criteria	Head of Dept.		Reviewer
	D, W or Y	D, W, C, O or Y	Comments
1. Curricular Topis			
2. Faculty Qualifications			
3. Other (if any)			

#	Criteria	Reviewer Decisions D, W, C or Y
1.	Students	
2.	Program Educational Objectives	
3.	Student Outcomes	
4.	Continuous Improvement	
5.	Curriculum	
6.	Faculty	
7.	Facilities	
8.	Institutional Support	
9.	Specific Program Criteria	