

Academic Scoring Rubrics (Final Version)
and Draft Guidelines for Authors

Criterion	Wght	9. Exceptional	5. Meets Expectations	1. Below Expectations
Quality of Faculty	16%	Faculty have a substantial body of achievements appropriate to their discipline (i.e. books, articles, films, presentations, conference papers, artistic pieces, awards, national and international recognition). There is also a high quality of teaching.	Faculty are typical to their peers in achievements appropriate to their discipline, as well as the quality of their teaching.	Faculty do not meet expectations relative to their peers in achievements appropriate to their discipline, as well as the quality of their teaching.
Quality of Students	16%	Performance, graduation rates, learning outcomes, and engagement of students, where applicable, are exceptionally high compared with peers in the discipline.	Performance, graduation rates, learning outcomes, and engagement of students, where applicable, are typical compared to peers in the discipline.	Performance, graduation rates, learning outcomes, and engagement of students are below expectations for the discipline.
Financial Efficiency	11%	The program is exceptional compared to peers in financial efficiency and there are many opportunities for fundraising.	The program is typical compared to peers in financial efficiency and opportunities for fundraising.	The program falls below expectations compared to peers in financial efficiency and fundraising.
Importance of Program to University Mission	16%	The program greatly contributes to the mission of the university, with high demand for teaching and research, as well as outreach and its role within the program portfolio (i. e. a package of programs appropriate to NIU's location, status and mission).	The program contributes to the mission of the university, with typical demand for teaching and research, as well as outreach and its role in the program portfolio.	The program struggles to contribute to the mission of the university, with lower demand for teaching and research, as well as little outreach and a limited role in the program portfolio.
Program Potential	11%	The program exhibits an exceptional amount of effort to improve effectiveness, and has created opportunities inside and across the boundaries of its discipline to create connections with other units or programs.	The program exhibits an expected amount of effort to improve effectiveness, and has demonstrated average effort inside and outside of its discipline to create connections.	The program exhibits a low amount of effort to improve effectiveness, and demonstrates little effort inside and outside of its discipline to create connections.

External Demand	11%	Demand for the program is exceptional compared to peers, demonstrating a positive trend of growth; it is seen as central to the future of the university.	Demand for the program is equivalent compared to peers, demonstrating a neutral or slightly positive trend of growth; it is seen as central to the future of the university.	Demand for the program is declining compared to peers, raising issues of its efficacy; it is questionable if it is necessary to the future of the university.
Internal Demand	14%	Enrollment in the program is high; the program is critical to other internal programs; trends for majors, non-majors, and student migration sustains a positive trajectory.	Enrollment in the program is at expected levels; the program is important to other programs; trends for majors, non-majors, and student migration shows a neutral or slightly positive trajectory.	Enrollment in the program is declining or poor; the program provides little service to other programs; trends for majors, non-majors, and student migration demonstrates a declining or flat-lined trajectory.
Contribution to Diversity	5%	The program exhibits an exceptional amount of diversity among faculty as well as the students compared to peers; it has demonstrated a variety of diversity actions.	The program exhibits an expected amount of diversity among faculty as well as the students; it has demonstrated some kinds of diversity actions.	The program exhibits little diversity among faculty as well as the students; it has demonstrated little in the way of diversity actions.

General guidelines for program evaluation:

Task Force members will assign one score to each criterion. We will take into account the questions that comprise each criterion in our evaluation, but the questions will not be scored separately. Based on our assessment of your answers within each criterion, members will assign the score of 9 (Exceeds Expectations), 5 (Meets Expectations), or 1 (Below Expectations) to the criterion as a whole.

The relevant context for “exceeds”, “meets”, or “below” for a given criterion may be your peer institutions or it may be other programs in the university. You may contextualize your answer in the manner that is best suited to your program for a given question or criterion, but please specify which context you are using in your answer. How do the attributes, quality, production, demand, etc. of each component of the criterion compare to your peer institutions? Where comparisons are internal to NIU, we use the term “program”, “complementary program”, or “internal program”.

We are aware that not all questions within individual criteria are relevant to all programs. We encourage authors to address this issue with the following: “This question is not relevant to this program because...” and then provide a brief sentence to say why this is so. We encourage authors not to worry about these inapplicable questions. *Programs will not be penalized for this.* Task Force members will take into account the other answers within the criterion in determining its score.

We are aware that the data authors are provided may be interpreted as incorrect, inadequate, or inappropriate to best reflect the attributes of their program. Rather than spend your limited space to explain the inadequacies of the data, we encourage you to briefly state that the institutionally-provided data do not adequately reflect the value and contributions of your program. Please provide a narrative that best informs the Task Force about the attributes of your program relative to your peers. You may supply your own data, but please do not feel compelled to do so if you believe you can adequately address the question in narrative form.

We are aware that some terms like “diversity” have many possible meanings. When writing narratives for each question, please inform the Task Force of the definition of the term as you understand it and are using it in your narrative.

To conclude, Task Force members encourage you to provide narratives that best help them to understand your program so that they can best evaluate its attributes and contributions to the university community and mission.