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Purpose for University Academic Program Review

Saint Louis University is committed to academic excellence in higher education and strives to provide high quality programs to its constituencies. Saint Louis University is committed to the periodic and ongoing evaluation of those programs. Program reviews ensure that all programs at Saint Louis University undergo periodic review to ensure continuous quality improvement (i.e., enhancement of classroom and program-level practices), including those that are reviewed through an external accreditation process. Thorough, systematic review of academic programs demonstrates that they are in alignment with University mission and strategic initiatives, and identifies program strengths and appropriate resource allocation. The program review process should be congruent with established academic unit and university assessment efforts, and should support long-term academic unit planning and strategic initiatives. Additionally, program reviews demonstrate the quality of academic programs and assessment efforts to key constituencies, including: current and prospective students; current and prospective faculty and staff, the University’s Board of Trustees, program- and University-level accrediting organizations, related academic units at other universities, state and federal departments of education, donors, alumni, and others.

In summary, academic program review is a process through which faculty, staff, and administrators collaborate to promote academic excellence, viability and accountability through:

- Identifying and prioritizing specific recommendations/actions needed for program improvement
- Identifying opportunities and rationales for program growth
- Identify interdisciplinary collaborative opportunities
- Identifying needs for investment and resource re-allocation (at multiple institutional levels) to support program improvement and/or growth
- Assessment of program strengths and weaknesses in the context of program-defined, discipline or professional standards of quality, as well as alignment with goals and outcomes as defined by the respective academic unit and the University

The outcomes of program reviews should greatly inform strategic planning – and, therefore, resource allocation and re-allocation – at the program, academic unit, and University levels.

Academic Programs for Review

The unit of direct review in all SLU academic program reviews will be the academic program; indirectly, critical elements of the administrative unit in which a program is housed (typically the department) will be reviewed, as well. All undergraduate- and post-baccalaureate-level academic programs at Saint Louis University are subject to the same program review requirement and process, regardless of campus or location at which the programs are offered, and regardless of the “delivery method” (campus-based, online, cohort model, etc.) including:

- Bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degree programs
- Concentrations, certificates and majors within degree programs
- Interdisciplinary majors and minors

September 11, 2015
• All co-curricular activities associated with an educational or degree program

While there may well be similarities between a given program’s disciplinary/specialized accreditation requirements and those of the University-directed program review, expectations of SLU’s program review will typically be more comprehensive, and more contextually-specific. Programs subject to external accreditation are encouraged to apply any reports, data, and disciplinary standards from the accreditation process toward the requirements of this process, as appropriate.

**Administration of Academic Program Review Process**

The Office of the Provost supports and insures a consistent and effective academic program review process. The program review process ensures that all programs -- including those subject to external accreditation -- engage in reviews that incorporate, but do not duplicate, recent and concurrent assessment efforts. The process also respects disciplinary and programmatic distinctions throughout a relatively standardized process to ensure procedural equity.

Programs should involve faculty and students in the review process, particularly during the data gathering and self-study stage. As appropriate, the Program Review Council (PRC) may make use of the expertise of standing committees such as undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees, assessment committees, teaching and research committees as well as department chairs and program directors.

The Assistant to the Provost for Academic Program Review is responsible for convening the academic program review process according to a pre-established time table. In addition, the Assistant to the Provost will coordinate the PRC process, the Annual Developmental Workshop, Initial Stakeholder Meeting, coordinate and distribute materials to the PRC and prepare materials for the Action Implementation Plan Meeting.

The Program Review protocol consists of the following components:

- **Annual Developmental Workshop**
  The Office of the Provost will annually provide a developmental workshop on the program review process and self-study guidelines for all chairs/directors, associate deans, and center directors/deans. Additional stakeholders may be invited.

- **Initial Stakeholder Meeting**
  Prior to the start of the academic program review process (Appendix A), the Provost will host an individual Provost stakeholder meeting with the dean, department chair/program director/center director of the academic unit(s) scheduled for academic review the following year, to discuss the process, the academic program’s strategic initiatives, and alignment with University strategic plan. In addition, the Associate Provost Undergraduate Education (APUE)/Associate Provost Graduate Education (APGE) for the appropriate level program or both AP’s and the Assistant to the Provost for Academic Program Review will attend this meeting.

- **Program Self-Study**
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The self-study will be a constituent-conducted, (faculty self-study team), data-informed analysis guided by an agreed-upon set of questions, disciplinary standards and evaluation method identified during the Initial Stakeholder Meeting. The self-study is designed to result in recommendations for improvement in program quality and viability. The evaluation is led by the department chair and/or program director and conducted against program/academic unit defined educational and operational outcomes, as well as against academic unit expectations for program quality. The departmental faculty self-study team includes the department chair or their designee and one or more senior faculty members of the department. The team is selected or elected according to the established governance process of the department or program. Once the department has selected or elected its committee, the dean must approve the proposed membership. See Appendix B Self-Study Topical Outline.

- **External Academic Program Review and Site Visit**
  An external review will be conducted by a team of expert faculty colleagues (typically 3 members) external to the University incorporating multiple perspectives from key campus stakeholders into the program review. The external reviewer(s) can identify and contextualize national and international environmental trends and future directions for the discipline (see Appendix C for Guiding Questions for External Reviewer) which may extend beyond an external accreditation criteria or standards. The external reviewer(s) will prepare a summary report, to be submitted within 30 calendar days of the visit, addressing program strengths and areas for improvements derived from site visit. The department/program under review nominates at least three to five external consultants, which may be based on discipline or professional standards or professional association recommendations, for the dean’s selection in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs. The external reviewer(s) will be in consultation with the Department Chair/Program Director, Dean, and Provost.

- **Program Director/Chair/Faculty Review of Program Self-Study and External Review Summary Report**
  The completed internal self-study and external reviewer(s) summary report are submitted to the academic program director/chair and program faculty for review and comment prior to review by the Dean. Once the review is complete, the Chair forwards the self-study, external reports, any department responses, and her/his own response and recommendations to the Dean.

- **Dean Review of Program Self-Study and External Review Summary Report**
  The completed internal self-study and external summary report are submitted to the dean of the academic unit for review and comment prior to review by the PRC. Once the dean’s review is complete, it may be returned to the Chair for additional comments in consultation with the program faculty. When complete, the dean forwards the self-study, external reports, any department responses, and his/her own response and recommendations to the co-chairs of the PRC.
- **Program Review Council Summary Report**
  The PRC, which reports to the Provost, has the responsibility of reviewing all internal and external materials pertinent to the program review and making recommendations to the Provost. The PRC is made up of the APUE and APGE, as co-chairs of the committee, the University Assessment Director, the Assistant Provost for Administration, and six faculty members recommended by the Faculty Senate and appointed by the Provost, serving staggered three-year terms with the option for re-appointment. The Provost, in consultation with the academic unit leadership, makes all final decisions regarding recommendations and subsequent actions. Additional faculty members, department chairs, and members of university leadership with a specific expertise or experience may be asked to assist with the review process for a specific unit.

PRC reviews will include the internal self-study, external reviewers’ summary report, external accreditation documents (when applicable), feedback received from Dean, Program Director/Chair and program faculty and the academic program’s strategic initiatives outlined in the initial stakeholder meeting. Based on the information provided, the PRC will prepare an overall academic program review summary report. This summary report will be sent to the Dean to distribute to the Chair/Program Director, and program faculty for feedback. The summary report and feedback is then submitted to the Provost and will be the focus of the Provost Review (see below).

- **Provost Review**
  The Provost will review each PRC Summary Report and meet with the respective dean, department chair/program director/center director, APUE/APGE for the appropriate level program or both AP’s, and the Assistant to the Provost for Academic Program Review. Their collective focus will be developing consensus on action plans, prioritizing chosen actions, and establishing a schedule for reviewing progress toward their accomplishment. The final PRC report and the summary of the Provost Review meeting are returned to the Dean and Program for review and implementation. The academic program review reports are considered confidential and are not to be distributed in paper or electronically outside of the academic program or current or potential interdisciplinary partners, Dean’s Office and the Office of Academic Affairs.

- **Action Plan Implementation**
  The action plan based on the internal program self-study and comments from all review groups will be discussed among the dean, department chair/program director, center directors/dean, the Assistant to the Provost for Academic Program Review and the Provost. Subsequently, on a schedule determined by the stakeholder group (deans, chairs, program directors, and/or center directors of the academic unit(s)) it will be the responsibility of the chair and respective dean to implement the action plan. On an annual basis, progress on the action plan will be reported to GAAC and/or UAAC as an informational item, by the academic unit UAAC/GAAC representative, as some of the action items may involve curricular programming changes subject to
GAAC/UAAC recommendations. Formal review of program accomplishments will be through the submission of one-and three-year action plan follow-up reports to the dean and Provost as well as the next full program review or at any point in the interim as determined by the Provost.

**Review Cycle**

All academic programs shall undergo formal academic program review on a typical 7-year cycle. *Additionally:*

- The initial formal review of new programs will occur in the third year of operation, and every seven years thereafter.
- Newer programs that began operation within five years of the date of the adoption of this process and have not yet engaged in formal program review will be the first programs scheduled for review.
- “Related” undergraduate- and post-baccalaureate-level programs – for example, an undergraduate major in English, an M.A. in English, and a Ph.D. in English – are to undergo review simultaneously unless accreditation or other circumstances dictate otherwise. Review may also include clusters of major concentrations or academic programs across academic units when interdisciplinary in nature.

The Office of Academic Affairs will work with each academic unit to develop and publish a rolling, academic program review schedule. Whenever possible the academic program review cycle shall be coordinated with any external accreditation review requirements that occur in fewer than or more than seven year intervals (subsequent reviews may be aligned with external accreditation cycles but should not occur at time intervals longer than the 7-year institutional cycle); upon approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, review terms may be moved up or delayed to best facilitate coordination with external program accreditation activity.

**Academic Program Review Oversight**

Although most elements of the academic program review process are to be faculty-and program-driven, there is a real need to dedicate administrative, fiscal, and human resources in support of the reviews. Accordingly, the Office of Academic Affairs has the responsibility for supporting the academic program review process and will therefore:

- Fund external reviewer(s) honoraria and travel expenses
- Oversee and coordinate the academic program review process (including establishing the scheduling of academic program reviews, communicating with departments/programs about the review, providing orientation to the process, maintaining files/records of self-studies and related program review reports, etc.)
- Provide compensation for faculty serving on the faculty self-study team when appropriate
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Ensure that the Office of the Provost (including the Assistant to the Provost for Academic Program Review and Assistant Provost of Administration), Office of Institutional Research, Office of Enrollment Management, and University Assessment Coordinator provide all necessary data and guidance to support programs undergoing review.
Appendix A
Academic Program Review Process

Developmental Workshop → Initial Stakeholder Meeting → Program Self Study → External Review and Site Visit → Program Review Council → Dean/Chair, Program Director and Faculty → Provost Review → Action Plan Implementation (Initial, 1 & 3 year follow-up)

- Provost
- Dean
- Chair
- Program/Center Director
- APUE/APGE
- Academic Program Review Coordinator

Dean Review of Self-Study → Program Director/Chair Review of Self-Study → Faculty and Self Study Team

- AP Administration
- PRC Report
- APGE
- APUE
- 6 Faculty Senate Reps
- 26 Faculty Senate Reps

Action Plan Determined
- Provost, Dean, Chair, Academic Program Review Coordinator, Faculty and Self-Study Team

Implementation Schedule Created
- Dean, Chair, Program/Center Director

Implementation Responsibility
- Dean, Chair, Program/Center Director
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Self-Study Topical Outline

The program review process ensures that all programs -- including those subject to external accreditation -- engage in reviews that incorporate, but do not duplicate, recent and concurrent assessment efforts. The process also respects academic disciplinary and programmatic distinctions throughout a relatively standardized process to ensure procedural equity. **Note:** please provide information only where applicable to program/department. **At the Initial Stakeholder Meeting each unit will receive self-study data to populate the self-study from the Office of Institutional Research. Please see the Academic Affairs website for additional information on academic definitions.**

Table of Contents

1. **Cover Page:** Use the standard SLU logo on your cover page available at the following website: [http://www.slu.edu/marcom/slubrand-identity/university-logos](http://www.slu.edu/marcom/slubrand-identity/university-logos)

2. **Executive Summary**
   A. Summary of the self-study document
   B. List of persons who were responsible for the preparation of the document

3. **Brief History of the Department or Program**

4. **Mission Statement of the Department; Departmental Goals; Program Goals**

5. **Description of the Department/Program's alignment with the University's Mission and strategic plan.**

6. **Undergraduate Program Description**
   A. Undergraduate degrees offered
      a. The number of undergraduate majors in the past five years (provided by OIR)
      b. The number of undergraduate minors in the past five years (provided by OIR)
      c. Numbers of undergraduate majors who graduated over the past five years (provided by OIR)
      d. Degree requirements - Core course requirements, major requirements (including professional body of knowledge, major or concentration courses and electives).
      e. Certificate programs (if any)
      f. Describe program enrollment specifically in the analysis of the taught/taken report (provided by OIR)
      g. Courses offered in following number ranges 1-10; 11-19; 22-49 and greater than 49 (provided by OIR)
      h. External accreditation, rankings and awards
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i. Identify peer and aspirant benchmark programs – identify 3-5 primary criteria on which benchmark and aspirational programs are premised

7. Undergraduate Student Information
   A. Faculty/student ratio (provided by OIR)
   B. Average class size (provided by OIR)
   C. Information on quality of students
      a. Number of applicants, acceptance rate, number accepted but not enrolled, number rejected (provided by OIR)
      b. Standardized test score data (provided by OIR)
      c. Number of graduates (provided by OIR), including plans for optimizing the number of graduates
      d. Graduate’s employment and post-baccalaureate education rate (provided by OIR)
      e. Information on department’s active involvement in recruitment and retention of students, including strategies for recruiting, retaining, and evaluating high academically performing students
      f. Summary of notable student accomplishments from the past five years

8. Post-Baccalaureate Program Descriptions
   A. Post-Baccalaureate degrees offered
      a. Certificate programs (if any)
      b. External accreditation, rankings and awards
      c. Peer and aspirant benchmark programs - identify 3-5 primary criteria on which benchmark and aspirational programs are premised
      d. Other benchmarks based on national reports, such as, The Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED).
      e. Requirements for various degrees
      f. Interdisciplinary relations
      g. Research requirements
      h. Clinical requirements

9. Post-Baccalaureate Student Information by Program (if more than one degree program)
   A. Faculty/Student Ratio (provided by OIR)
   B. Information on Quality of Students
      a. Number of applicants, acceptance rate, number accepted but not enrolled, number rejected for the past five years (provided by OIR)
      b. Undergraduate GPA and standardized test score data (provided by OIR)
      c. Enrollments in the past five years (provided by OIR)
         i. Profile of students—demographic data, undergraduate or master’s programs
      d. Number of graduates (provided by OIR), including plans for optimizing the number of graduates
      e. Information concerning department’s active involvement in recruitment and retention of students, including strategies for recruiting, retaining, and evaluating high academically performing students
         i. Time to degree for past five master’s and doctoral cohorts (where applicable)
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f. Number and percentage of students in entering cohorts for the past five years who dropped out of the program and point in program at which they dropped out; identify numbers and percentages who were counseled out of the program following annual reviews (provided by OIR)

g. If students are admitted on probation, number and percentage of students admitted on probation; success rates for degree completion (provided by OIR)

h. Number and percentage of students placed on probation; success rates for degree completion (provided by OIR)

i. Number of students on extensions, number of extensions, and average length of time on extensions by program degree level (provided by the Office of Graduate Education)

j. Average GPA of graduating students (provided by OIR)

k. Number and percentage of students who fail preliminary exams, master’s exams, or thesis, project, or dissertation defenses (provided by the Office of Graduate Education)

C. Placement of graduate students

a. Number and percentage of students for each of the last five graduating cohorts who were employed or had pending employment (provided by the Office of Graduate Education &/or academic unit)

i. At time of graduation
   ii. Within three months of graduation
   iii. Within six months of graduation
   iv. Within one year of graduation

b. Where are students employed (for each of the past five cohorts)

c. Contributions (as defined by academic discipline) to the field by graduates—past five years

d. Professional development opportunities for graduate students
   i. Number of students annually completing Reinert Center teaching certificates (if appropriate / relevant)
   ii. Number of students annually participating in research symposia (Sigma Xi, Graduate Student Association, department)
   iii. Number of students attending professional development workshops hosted on campus, through professional associations, at other universities, corporate or industry; identify type
   iv. Number of students with internships or other training programs, such as, practica, clinical learning experience, etc.
   v. Number of students working with external stakeholders on research or projects
   vi. Number of students annually with teaching, tutoring, or lab supervision experience

10. Faculty

A. Number of full-time faculty – by category (provided by OIR)

B. Credits and headcount of students taught by faculty (provided by OIR)

C. Number of graduate students taught per academic year (can include directed readings, etc. but not thesis or dissertation direction) (provided by OIR)
D. Number of adjunct faculty - courses taught and number of students for each course, by year and term over past two years (provided by OIR)
E. Number of clinical faculty (if applicable) (provided by OIR)
F. Evidence of quality teaching as defined by academic discipline, including strategies for enhancing teaching effectiveness
G. Faculty scholarship (Activity Insight report provided by OIR)
   a. Monographs
   b. Publications
   c. Exhibitions/performances/license agreements/patents
   d. Presentations at professional meetings
   e. Funded projects (awarded and submitted) – identify strategies for optimizing the amount of funded research and scholarship
   f. Other
H. Faculty service, including strategies for strengthening professional, University, and community partnerships (Activity Insight report provided by OIR)
   a. To the profession
   b. To the University
   c. To the community
   d. To clinical practice
I. Professional honors and awards (Activity Insight report provided by OIR)
J. Number of mentees/advisees per undergraduate faculty member (annual average for past five years)
K. Number of mentees/advisees per graduate faculty member (annual average for past five years)
L. Number of theses and/or dissertations completed per graduate faculty member (annual average for the past five years)

11. Response to the Recommendations from Previous Reviews
   A. List the recommendations from the last program review
   B. List the actions taken in response to the last review

12. Major Changes in Program (within the last five years and anticipated for the next five years)
   A. Discipline or field
   B. Student demand
   C. Occupational demand
   D. Societal need
   E. Current and future areas of concern for the department/program

13. Student Learning Outcomes
   A. Describe and provide examples of assessment measures used for each program offered.
   B. Describe how assessment information is used to improve the curriculum, teaching, learning, and the assessment program itself; provide specific examples.
   C. What is the evidence that feedback and adjustments actually have improved the curriculum, instruction, and student learning?
14. **Resources Currently Available**
   A. Personnel: Description of staff; and roles and responsibilities of graduate assistants. Include all faculty vitae.
   B. Facilities and major equipment (including start-up costs)
   C. General expense budget
   D. Adequacy and impact of library resources and services: research services, student referrals and consultations, library instruction services and course support.
   E. Other resources

15. **Plans to Modify Resources Over the Next Three Years (differentiate desired and necessary resources and include a plan for procuring funds for resources)**
   A. Personnel
   B. Facilities and equipment
   C. Other resources, such as, clinical practice
   D. Connection to departmental and program goals
   E. Anticipated sources of resources

16. **Current strengths that support the achievement of program goals**
   A. List and describe

17. **Current weaknesses that impede the achievement of program goals**
   A. List and describe

18. **Future opportunities to explore in the achievement of program goals**
   A. List and describe

19. **Future threats to overcome in the achievement of program goals**
   A. List and describe
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Guiding Questions for On-Site External Reviewer

1. **Programs and Curricula**
   a. Does the program have a well-defined mission and an appropriate corresponding statement of goals?
   b. Do the mission and goals shape and give direction to the program?
   c. Are the curricular offerings adequate to justify the number of options within the programs in the department?
   d. Are the program requirements appropriate?
   e. Is there evidence of periodic curricular review, introduction of new courses, course syllabi?
   f. Is there evidence that the courses of the program serve other departments and schools of the university?
   g. Is there other evidence of interdepartmental cooperation?
   h. Are the program's plans and/or goals appropriate given the external and internal environment?
   i. Highlight the strengths and areas of improvement for the program.

2. **Faculty**
   a. What is the morale of the faculty?
   b. Is there evidence of faculty productivity, of standing nationally, of initiative in seeking support for research opportunities and/or undertaking service to the community?
   c. Is the program's experience in recruiting and retaining faculty appropriate or successful?
      Is the faculty workload attractive? Are teaching/research resources suitable?
   e. Is there effective leadership in the program?

3. **Students**
   a. Is the program successful in the advising and counseling of students?
   b. Does the program appropriately monitor the progress of students and assist students in job placement?
   c. Does the program have appropriate Student Learning Outcomes, assess these regularly, and use the results to make improvements?

4. **Physical Facilities and Other Resources (library, institutional and research support)**
   a. To what extent have core library services (i.e., research services; student referrals and consultations; library instruction services; and course support) contributed to or been perceived to have contributed to the success of the program? Are the computer facilities appropriate and adequate to faculty and student course usage and research?
   b. Is the level of institutional support and research support adequate for the programs of the Department?

5. **Areas of Excellence**
   a. Are there areas of particular excellence or innovative program development?
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6. **Areas of Concern**
   a. Are there areas of concern?
   b. What recommendations are appropriate for the program at this time?

### Appendix D

**Academic Program Review Rubric**

Academic Program Name: __________________________________________

Reviewer Name: ________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>1 Early Development</th>
<th>2 Developing</th>
<th>3 Highly Developed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview: Mission and Goals</strong></td>
<td>Overview is incomplete; program has not created mission or goals or mission and goals are not aligned with university mission and goals.</td>
<td>Program has established its own set of mission and goals unique to the program, but mission and goals are not aligned with university mission and goals.</td>
<td>Program has established its own set of mission and goals unique to the program, AND are aligned with university mission and goals and stated clearly and concisely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff Resources</strong></td>
<td>No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development and faculty diversity; no succession planning (recruitment, retention, retirement, needs) is evident. Temporary/adjunct faculty teach majority of the courses in the curriculum. Program does not use/refer to academic and student support services.</td>
<td>Discussion of faculty trends; preliminary planning for program development, faculty diversity recruitment and retention. All courses are taught by highly qualified faculty. Program uses/refers to academic and student support services to a limited extent. Limited faculty scholarship/research trends or Explicit planning for program development based on faculty diversity and recruitment/retention needs. Supporting data used in planning.</td>
<td>All courses taught by high quality faculty current in the academic discipline. Program draws upon relevant academic and student services to increase program effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment and Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of faculty scholarship/research trends or plans.</td>
<td>No analysis of program enrollment and degree production in the context of program development, capacity and sustainability. No discussion of student diversity and plans to increase student diversity through recruitment.</td>
<td>Widespread faculty scholarship/research portfolios across the Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>No analysis of program enrollment and degree production in the context of program development, capacity and sustainability. No discussion of student diversity and plans to increase student diversity through recruitment.</td>
<td>Uses some rudimentary analysis of trends in enrollment and degree production in the context of program quality and sustainability. No discussion of employment projections or prospects for program graduates. Some discussion about student diversity and planning for recruitment.</td>
<td>Well-developed and successful plans for student diversity recruitment, retention and success. Data analysis reflects trends and understanding of both internal and external forces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uses some rudimentary analysis of trends in enrollment and degree production in the context of program quality and sustainability. No discussion of employment projections or prospects for program graduates. Some discussion about student diversity and planning for recruitment.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11, 2015</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Other Resources** | No discussion about resource adequacy.  
No 7-year planning for resources.  
Does not identify needs or priorities.  
Does not identify important contextual factors or extenuating circumstances related to resource planning. | Preliminary discussion of the adequacy of resources; no resource planning or identification of potential new revenue streams for the next 7 years.  
Identifies needs or sets priorities, but not linked to data. Limited discussion of context and extenuating circumstances affecting resource planning. | Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 7-year period; uses data to identify program needs and priorities.  
Developed understanding of unique program circumstances affecting resource needs. Informed by comparison to peer universities. |
| **Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment** | Program-level student learning outcomes not present or vague and not measurable.  
Courses or experiences required for the degree/certificate are listed but not linked to the SLOs.  
Assessment methods are not identified; no evidence of use of assessment results to improve curriculum, academic support services, faculty development, etc. | Program-level student learning outcomes clear and measurable, indirect and direct measures of learning are used.  
Program uses results to improve curriculum, academic support services, and faculty development, etc.  
Evidence of administrative support for assessment and resources for regular data collection. | Program-level student learning outcomes are clear and measurable with indirect and direct measures of learning.  
Courses listed and linked to SLOs (curriculum mapping).  
Program uses results to improve curriculum, academic support services, and faculty development, etc.  
Evidence of administrative support, use of regular data collection to support assessment. |
### Analysis and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discussion of strengths, accomplishments and improvements needed are not supported in review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan does not address curricular or program challenges ahead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reflects spirit of continuous improvement; 1 and 3-year plan identified with one area targeted for improvement.
- Specific program/curricular changes are discussed and based on evidence and trends; goals supported in review document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reflects spirit of continuous improvement and self-reflection; 7-year plan identified with two or more areas targeted for improvement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific program/curricular changes are discussed and based on evidence and trends; realistic goals supported in review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response to Previous Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program did not address or implement recommendations, nor give an explanation for not doing so.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program implemented some recommendations. Provides explanation for not addressing all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program effectively addressed most, if not all, recommendations or incorporated them into its current 7-year plan.

### Additional Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________.
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