### C. OUTSIDE REVIEWER RUBRIC (suggested)

The report of the Outside Reviewer should address any areas where improvement might be implemented as noted above, particularly for items with ratings of 3 or lower or where discussion is necessary. Ideas for improvement are welcomed, as are areas worthy of praise. Please be sure to support your ratings and review. Cite specific examples or data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Self-study:</th>
<th>Definitions or rephrasing</th>
<th>Scoring plan</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Compare the previous five-year review with the current state of the program. Is the program generally moving in a direction consistent with the field? | As an expert in the field, has the program chosen directions that are generally consistent with choices at other institutions of higher learning? | 4 = clearly related to direction of field  
3 = related with some differences  
2 = related, but lacking clarity of vision  
1 = not related to movement in the field | | |
| Study the requests for new faculty for the program. Are the requests consistent with the current direction of the field? | Are the proposed new hires relevant to standard needs or changes in the field? | 4 = very consistent with direction of field  
3 = consistent with direction of field  
2 = consistent with direction of field, but over or under ambitious for program  
1 = not consistent with direction of field | | |
| Study the Outcomes Assessment portion of the self-study. Are the outcomes and their assessment mechanisms reasonable for the field and the programs? | These statements describe essential educational content covered in order to achieve the program mission/goals. They identify in content-centered terms (e.g., concepts, theories, paradigms, etc.) the knowledge and skills the program aims to convey. | 4 = outcomes related to goals; thought out  
3 = outcomes described with some clarity  
2 = outcomes described, but generally lacking vision or appropriateness  
1 = outcomes not clear or inappropriate | | |
| Study the student/program statistics provided. Do these numbers reflect national trends in the field? Are SFRs appropriate to the field? | Would other programs have class sizes or student faculty ratios (SFR) of similar size? Is the field growing or shrinking in the areas that this program is trying to move? | 4 = shows better than expected statistics and trends for programs like this one  
3 = shows appropriate statistics and trends for programs like this one  
2 = shows somewhat similar numbers to like programs  
1 = shows numbers inappropriate to the field | | |
| Compare the program requirements for CSUEB and similar programs in the CSU and UC. Are the program’s requirements reasonable for its position in the field? | These are lists, tables, or other schema showing requirements within programs as they relate to overall student learning objectives (e.g., showing hierarchical programmatic connections and/or explaining how courses fit together within degree programs and other course sequences such as options, minors, credentials, or concentrations, etc.). | 4 = requirements well aligned with other programs  
3 = requirements appropriate  
2 = requirements somewhat aligned  
1 = requirements not aligned with similar programs | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Academic Plan</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Scoring plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study the planned curricular changes.</td>
<td>Are the proposed curricular changes reasonable for the field and appropriate for the program? Is there a need for the proposed changes? Considering the three areas: description of curricular changes, appropriateness of these changes, and linkage to program objectives.</td>
<td>4 = curricular changes clearly described, appear appropriate, and linked to program objectives 3 = curricular changes fall short in one 2= curricular changes fall short in two 1 = proposed changes are not appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the national and regional trends for student growth in the field.</td>
<td>Do you expect the number of majors to increase in the next five years?</td>
<td>4 = number of students should increase dramatically in this field 3 = number of students should increase slightly 2= number of students should remain flat 1 = number of students will decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the national and regional trends for employment in the field.</td>
<td>Do you expect jobs to increase and students in this program to be prepared for changes in the job market requirements?</td>
<td>4 = number of jobs should increase in this field and students should be prepared 3 = number of students should increase slightly 2= number of students should remain flat 1 = number of students will decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the resources required for implementing proposed changes.</td>
<td>Are the resources realistic and adequate to the intended purpose?</td>
<td>4 = realistic and adequate 3 = realistic and probably adequate 2 = realistic but more resources are necessary 1 = unrealistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Overall evaluation of the plan. | Considering the plan overall, how would you rate its quality, potential for benefiting the program, and likelihood of completion if resources are allocated to this plan? | 4 = very likely to be successful  
3 = likely to be successful  
2 = could succeed at a later time  
1 = unlikely to be successful |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall considerations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scoring plan</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In your judgment are the program requirements adequate to meet the goals of the program? | Be sure to consider where students graduating from the program are expected to go next, workplace, etc. | 4 = such description is explicitly offered  
3 = such description is at least implied  
2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this  
1 = no such description offered |
| In your opinion, is adequate breadth present in the program? | Do students get exposure to a broad enough field of study, including interdisciplinary coursework? | 4 = breadth of program is admirable  
3 = breadth of program is adequate  
2 = breadth needs some improvement  
1 = breadth is inadequate |
| In your opinion, is adequate depth present in the program? | Do students get exposure to a deep enough field of study, including interdisciplinary coursework? | 4 = depth of program is admirable  
3 = depth of program is adequate  
2 = depth needs some improvement  
1 = depth is inadequate |
| **Questions** | **Additional considerations** | **Scoring plan** |
| In your judgment is the number of tenure-track faculty adequate to meet the goals of the program if no new positions are added? | Be sure to consider options available for adjunct faculty. | 4 = current number of faculty is adequate  
3 = nearly adequate considering adjunct faculty  
2 = number of faculty inadequate by one  
1 = inadequate by two or more |
| In your opinion is the number of tenure-track faculty consistent with similar programs or meets the expected numbers for programs of this size? | Please consider the use of adjunct faculty at similar institutions. | 4 = number of faculty meets expectations  
3 = nearly meets expectations considering adjunct faculty  
2 = number of faculty inadequate by one  
1 = inadequate by two or more |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Site Visit</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your judgment are the facilities (space, equipment, technology), adequate to meet the goals of the program if no new resources are added?</td>
<td>Be sure to consider options that are available to the program in terms of raising outside funding.</td>
<td>4 = the current facilities are adequate&lt;br&gt;3 = the current facilities are nearly adequate&lt;br&gt;2 = the facilities need improvement&lt;br&gt;1 = the facilities are inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your judgment are the facilities (space, equipment, technology), consistent with similar programs or programs of this size?</td>
<td>Please consider the use of outside funding raising at similar institutions.</td>
<td>4 = breadth of program is admirable&lt;br&gt;3 = breadth of program is adequate&lt;br&gt;2 = breadth needs some improvement&lt;br&gt;1 = breadth is inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your site visit to campus consider the library holdings and services for the discipline.</td>
<td>Be sure to consider options that are available to the program in terms of obtaining outside library resources. Are these adequate to the degree program offered?</td>
<td>4 = library holdings/services are adequate&lt;br&gt;3 = holdings/services nearly adequate&lt;br&gt;2 = journals are inadequate&lt;br&gt;1 = library holdings (texts) are inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While on campus you will meet with and discuss the program with students currently in the program.</td>
<td>Consider the nature of the comments of the students. Consider their educational goals. Do students seem satisfied with the program?</td>
<td>4 = students seem highly satisfied&lt;br&gt;3 = students seem adequately satisfied&lt;br&gt;2 = students seem somewhat satisfied&lt;br&gt;1 = students seem inadequately satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will meet with and discuss the program with lecturers/adjunct faculty from the program.</td>
<td>Consider the breadth, flexibility, and scope these faculty add to the program.</td>
<td>4 = adjunct faculty enhance program&lt;br&gt;3 = adjunct faculty are adequate, involved&lt;br&gt;2 = adjunct faculty adequate, not involved&lt;br&gt;1 = adjunct faculty are inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While on campus you may meet with and discuss the program with alumni from the program.</td>
<td>Consider the enthusiasm and interest of the alumni and adjunct faculty. Consider their ability to enhance the program offerings both in terms of curriculum and financial contributions.</td>
<td>4 = alumni participate actively&lt;br&gt;3 = alumni participate somewhat&lt;br&gt;2 = alumni participation is low&lt;br&gt;1 = alumni participation is not appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While on campus you may meet with and discuss the program with staff from the program</td>
<td>Do the staff member(s) seem adequate in terms of support for the program? Are they enthusiastic and dedicated to the program?</td>
<td>4 = staff enhance program&lt;br&gt;3 = staff enhance program, but stretched&lt;br&gt;2 = staff are barely adequate&lt;br&gt;1 =staff are inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synthesis: Overall quality of plan**
### Summary

In your opinion does the program adequately utilize information from its academic program review process and its assessment processes?

### Additional considerations

The program should present a well-developed and coherent assessment plan that includes continuous and well-integrated linkage among review, assessment, planning, and implementation activities.

### Scoring plan

- 4 = definitely
- 3 = probably
- 2 = possibly, but uncertain
- 1 = definitely not

### Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Synthesis</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of scores out of possible 100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average of scores

The report of the Outside Reviewer should address any areas where improvement might be implemented as noted above, particularly for items with ratings of 3 or lower or where discussion is necessary. Ideas for improvement are welcomed, as are areas worthy of praise. Please be sure to support your ratings and review. Cite specific examples or data.