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1. INTRODUCTION

Program Review is a vital process at Azusa Pacific University (APU) and within higher education in general. It provides the opportunity for us to demonstrate our educational effectiveness to ourselves, our students, our accrediting agencies, and the various communities we serve. It is a faculty-governed process that produces objective information useful for decision-making at every level—department, school or college, and the university as a whole. Consequently, program review is an essential, systematic, and periodic process in which all academic programs participate. It is critical we invest adequate time and energy in this shared requirement.

This handbook sets forth the standards and procedures governing the APU academic program review process. It stipulates the common program review process for all academic programs, graduate and undergraduate. Program review and this handbook are also designed to address both Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation standards as well as elements unique to APU (for example, faith integration).

“A program is defined as a systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses, forming a considerable part, or all, of the requirements for a degree or credential; [it] may refer to the total educational offering of an institution” (WASC Handbook of Accreditation, 2008). For purposes of program review, the following guidelines will be used to schedule program review: at the graduate level, all programs offering a degree are subject to independent program reviews; at the undergraduate level, all majors and stand-alone minors are subject to independent program reviews; undergraduate programs that share more than 50% of their curriculum with another program may request permission to conduct a joint program review. All requests for exceptions are filed with the appropriate program review committee.

Formal program review is based on and must incorporate an academic program’s systematic and ongoing assessment. Simply put, all program reviews must adequately reflect the assessment activities completed in the years prior to the review report.

1.1. Program Review Assumptions

Three basic assumptions underpin program review at APU:

1. Program review is a faculty-governed, comprehensive assessment and evaluation process that incorporates qualitative and quantitative evidence (data) to support assertions made in the written report. Unsupported assertions or comments are discouraged.

2. Quality is not easily defined or evaluated. Nevertheless, quality is indicated through such things as demonstrated student achievement, faculty accomplishments, curricular design, resource management, and ongoing planning, assessment, evaluation, and program improvement.

3. Program review is a self-examination process designed to assist academic departments in improving their academic programs and better serving their students. Consequently, vigorous and candid analysis, with a focus on program improvement, must characterize all program reviews. Programs that use self-congratulatory language and/or claim excellence in all areas will have difficulty meeting this important assumption.
1.2. Purpose for Program Review

Program review enables APU, through its schools and colleges, and their departments, to examine the effectiveness of all its academic programs—to strengthen and maintain the university’s curriculum within a faith-based context, by generating and pursuing informed recommendations related to student learning, program design, faculty effectiveness, and resource allocation aimed at achieving the university’s Academic Vision 2022.

On a more pragmatic note, systematic program review is a process required by the regional accrediting agency, the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations (2008 WASC Handbook of Accreditation, CFR 2.7)

IMPORTANT: In conjunction with the strategic planning process, program review offers the program and/or department faculty the opportunity to make the case, if needed, for additional resources. Assessment evidence collected in the years preceding the review provides data to justify decision-making and resource allocation.

1.3. Accountability for Program Review

Program review is a faculty-governed and university-owned process. As such, there are a variety of constituencies who have accountability to the process.

The APU faculty, through the Undergraduate, Master’s, and Doctoral Studies Councils and corresponding Program Review Committees (PRCs)—undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral—are responsible for determining program review standards, as well as reviewing and evaluating current academic programs to ensure that those standards are met. Council and PRC actions fall under the governance of the Faculty Senate.

Designated staff in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) and Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CTLA) are responsible for providing data to programs and working with the councils to coordinate the overall program review process on the university’s behalf. Specifically, the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review serves as the administrative contact for the program review process by helping departments connect annual assessments with the program review cycle, collaborating with programs to provide the most accurate and meaningful data, sending out program review notifications, receiving and distributing program review reports, maintaining the program review master schedule, monitoring the various program review processes, and archiving past program review reports. Close communication among programs, PRCs, OIRA and the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review is vital to sustaining an efficient and clear program review process.

The program’s department chair or program director, and the full-time faculty in the program undergoing review, share the responsibility for conducting the review and preparing a report (use the Program Review Report Template found under separate cover). The department chair or program director may organize and accomplish the review in a manner she/he thinks most appropriate but retains the overall responsibility for completing the review on schedule. All full-time program faculty should be involved in and able to discuss the results of program review.

The administration of the university is responsible for reviewing program reviews and determining the
budgetary and resource support that is available to the program, as well as utilizing program review reports to inform strategic planning and budgeting at the department, school/college, and university level.

1.4. Clarifying Program Review Committees and their Work

Program Review Committee (PRC)
Each council (undergraduate, master’s, doctoral) oversees the program review process for its respective academic level by selecting a standing Program Review Committee (PRC), which consists of at least one member from the council who chairs the committee and whose membership must meet the qualifications as described below. The PRC is responsible for evaluating the quality of each Program Review Report and providing a recommendation to accept or not accept a program review to its respective council.

Program Review Committee Membership Criteria
The guidelines for PRC membership are identified below:

- Committee membership normally includes 3 to 5 members, with no more than 2 members from any one department or program. In cases where a program to which a PRC member belongs is scheduled for review, the PRC member must recuse her/himself from all official evaluation of that program.
- At least one PRC member (the chair) must come from the council. Other qualified PRC members may be selected from faculty at the same level (e.g., doctoral) within or outside the council.
- As stated in the APU Faculty Handbook, ex-officio members may be appointed by the council or PRC as needed. Additionally, programs undergoing review may request the addition of a specific faculty member from an outside department to join the team reviewing their specific program.
- Per WASC guidelines, one PRC member should have expertise or training in outcomes assessment, in order to evaluate the quality of student learning outcomes and assessment strategies utilized by the program undergoing review (note: the external reviewer, if utilized, or a specially appointed faculty member may serve in this role).

Authority of the Program Review Committee
As stated in the APU Faculty Handbook, each PRC is charged with assessing and documenting the effectiveness of the program curriculum at its level to ensure that program goals are being met. This charge is carried out via program review. In this regard, the PRC has the authority to request edits to a Program Review Report when the submitted work fails to address required components of the report, provides incomplete or inaccurate information, reaches faulty conclusions, or fails to identify appropriate goals in light of the evidence provided in the report. In all cases, requests for edits are made through the lens of program improvement and should be clearly communicated in a timely and collegial fashion. These edits are requested prior to any formal evaluation of the report and should not be included as part of the PRC’s final report (see below) unless they remain unaddressed by the program. Once requests for edits have been made by a PRC, a program may choose to respond by making requested edits or by providing further rationale for the contents of the report. No more than two weeks should transpire between a PRC request for edits and the submission of a revised report.

Communicating the Results of Program Review
Once a program has responded to the request for edits and submitted its final version of the Program Review Report, the PRC completes the Program Review Committee Report and Rubric for Assessing Program Review Reports (see Appendices A and B). In these documents, PRCs are expected to comment, with recommended action steps, on the quality of the written report and the appropriateness of the program’s goals. The PRC may also identify goals it believes may facilitate program improvement in the future but may not require action by the program as a contingency for approving a program report.

To clarify its analysis, the PRC utilizes the Rubric for Assessing Program Review Reports (Appendix B). While an assigned score for each component is requested, a PRC may choose not to assign scores but to categorize each component under one of the four descriptors (e.g., emerging, developed, etc.).
As part of the communication process, the PRC is required to formally present its findings and recommendations to the program undergoing review, through a face-to-face meeting with the program faculty or a program representative. At the program’s request, students may also be invited to this event. Programs have opportunity at that time to correct errors of fact before the PRC report is sent to the council for a final vote. If, after the face-to-face meeting, there are disagreements related to the PRC recommendation, a program may request, in writing, the opportunity to appear at the council meeting when the program review is scheduled for council action and may ask for council intervention to remedy the disagreement. The council will summarize the program’s request in writing, make a ruling and note its action as part of the minutes of the meeting.

The council receives a PRC’s final report and rubric, along with the recommendation to accept or not accept the program review, and votes an official response, which is communicated to both the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review and to the Faculty Senate (via council minutes).

Once a program is approved by the council¹, all program review materials are sent by the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review to the dean. The dean reviews all relevant materials and meets with program faculty to share his/her perspective. Following the face-to-face meeting, each dean records his/her official findings in the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding. The completed Administrative Response (see Appendix C) and Memorandum of Understanding (see Appendix D) are returned to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review who will provide copies to the program faculty and the appropriate vice provost. Once the program reviews for a school are complete, the dean will meet with the provost to summarize the findings. In conjunction with the strategic planning process, program review materials are considered by The Administrative Cabinet (TAC) to inform budgeting and strategic planning decisions.

Making Changes to Program Review
In addition to review of each program, the PRC and its council also recommend, review, and propose changes to the program review handbook and template. To accomplish this, all proposed program review changes are sent in advance to each PRC, whose members then provide opportunity for feedback from its council. Following a review period not to exceed 3 weeks, a joint council meeting takes place to vote on recommended changes to the program review process. The meeting is scheduled and attended by the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review (from the CTLA), who serves in a non-voting, ex-officio capacity, and must include at the minimum each PRC chair and one other designated representative from either the PRC or the council. Each council may determine the appropriate number of attendees to send to the meeting. All changes to program review are finalized at the meeting and recorded in a set of meeting minutes that are communicated to each council and sent by the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review to the Faculty Senate for senate approval. All changes to program review documents are made by the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review.

1.5. Program Review Cycle

Academic programs are scheduled to conduct a program review and write a report on a seven-year rotating cycle, or concurrent with external professional accreditation (see 1.6. below), with a Mid-Cycle Status Report due 3 years from the date the report was prepared. New programs are scheduled for review following an initial five-year developmental period. The Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review) maintains the Program Review Master Schedule, in consultation with the three councils and their PRCs. The schedule is a flexible document and undergoes changes from time to time. (The current schedule is available on the

¹ If a program is not approved by the Council, a meeting with the program faculty, dean, council chair and PRC chair is scheduled to resolve differences. In rare instances, the Office of the Provost may be asked to render a final decision.
APU website: www.apu.edu/oira) Requests for extensions or changes to the Program Review Master Schedule must be approved by the appropriate PRC, who then notifies the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review. Changes are not final until reflected on the Program Review Master Schedule.

Extensions on Program Review Reports do not result in altering the long-term Program Review Master Schedule. Programs which are granted an extension must still meet the date/year the next program review is due.

1.6. Program Review and External Accrediting Agency

When possible, academic programs with external professional accreditation are scheduled for an APU program review in close proximity to the production of their professional accreditation documents. Generally, programs which have produced accreditation reports are scheduled for an APU program review within six (6) months of that time, so that they may use their professional accreditation report as the primary basis of the APU Program Review Report. In order to create consistency in reporting and ease of review by peers, accredited programs may be asked to “cut and paste” the appropriate sections of their professional accreditation documents into the APU report template. In rare cases, the program may be granted permission to use the professional accreditation report in lieu of the APU program review template. In such cases, the submitted documents would still contain the standardized table of contents from the report template, clearly identifying where each of the APU-required data exhibits and response items are located in the professional accreditation report. Additionally, if any APU program review components or requirements are not included in the accreditation report, the program must provide this additional information in the APU Program Review Report.

1.7. Program Review External Reviewers

Academic programs not accredited by an external accrediting agency are required to utilize an outside (external to APU) reviewer who reviews program materials and submits a written analysis as part of the review process. In the spring prior to the program review, the department chair or program director is responsible for identifying a qualified reviewer and completing the External Reviewer Request and Authorization Form (see Appendix E). Stipend amounts for the external reviewer are determined by the dean and funded through the provost’s office. All travel expenses for bringing the external reviewer to campus are to be covered from the program’s budget unless negotiated differently with the dean. Once a reviewer is selected and approved, the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review manages the necessary paperwork for hiring the external reviewer (see Appendix F).

According to standards proposed by the WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review, external reviewers should meet the following criteria:

- Distinguished scholar/teacher/practitioner in the field
- Chosen from a campus similar to APU
- When possible, experienced with program administration
- When possible, experienced with assessing student learning outcomes
- Familiar with APU’s mission and purpose

External reviewers are selected in advance of program review but are utilized after the review has been written. Although the Program Review Report is read in its entirety, the external reviewer focuses on Components A-E and may request additional materials from a program in order to 1) review curricular offerings for relevance, currency, and quality; 2) review the appropriateness and effectiveness of strategies used to assess student learning and other program outcomes; 3) ensure decisions and actions taken by the department/program, based on assessment, are in keeping with best practices in the academic discipline; 4) evaluate the quality of faculty teaching and breadth of faculty scholarly activities and accomplishments; 5) evaluate the program’s effectiveness at recruiting and retaining successful students; and 6) provide an evidence-based analysis of the program’s strengths and areas in need of improvement relative to comparable programs. External reviewers may choose to visit the campus in
order to verify materials that are referenced by the program and to interview faculty, students, and administrators in order to obtain the most accurate information. Campus visits should be scheduled within two weeks of receiving a program’s materials (unless over a holiday period), and the report should be submitted within two weeks of a campus visit.

The external reviewer completes the External Reviewer Report (see Appendix G), as well as the Rubric for Assessing a Program Review Report (Appendix B) and submits it to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, who then forwards it to the department chair/program director and the Program Review Committee (PRC) chair to be included as part of the Program Review Report.

1.8. Timely Completion of Program Review

All attempts are made by the university to support the timely completion of program reviews. In addition to having access to the 7-year Program Review Master Schedule, programs are notified of the impending review and given their program data in the spring prior to the fall due date. Because the university is striving to incorporate program review results into the strategic planning and budgeting processes, it is in a program’s best interest to complete the review by the date assigned, so that the identified needs may be considered in this process.

When a department or program fails to complete its required program review within the expected time limits, sanctions may occur. At the council level, the program may be placed on moratorium and not permitted to bring curricular proposals or other matters before the appropriate council until the report is approved by the PRC. Programs submitting late reviews will not be granted extensions on the subsequent review due date but will be expected to complete their next review as scheduled.

2. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Program review is a systematic process completed in five phases: 1) preparing for the program review, 2) writing the report, 3) reviewing and evaluating the report, 4) responding to the findings of program review, and 5) reporting on the progress following the review. The process is described below and is also summarized with timelines in Table One and via flow chart in Appendix I.

2.1 PHASE ONE: Preparing for the Program Review

Phase One begins when the department receives notification from the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, during the preceding fall semester, that they are scheduled to complete a program review during the fall semester of the next academic year. The dean of the school or college in which the program resides also receives notification.

The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), ensures that the department chair/program director has a copy of the Program Review Handbook and Program Review Report Template (also available at www.apu.edu/oira) and all data necessary for analysis. Data not yet available will be identified and a plan for securing that data will be communicated to the program. In some cases, complete data will not be available and programs may need to supplement required tables with their own data.

Soon after notification of review, the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review will set up a meeting with the department chair/program director to:

- Discuss the review process
- Clarify requirements for the written report
- Make clear any assistance provided in preparing, conducting, and reporting the review
- Discuss the projected timeline for completing the program review
- Help the program develop a strategy for completing the review and meeting the expected due date
For non-accredited programs, the department chair/program director and faculty will identify a qualified external reviewer and acquire appropriate approvals for hiring him or her (see Section 1.7 for details).

Programs are strongly encouraged to begin the program review process in spring so that reports can be submitted on time in the fall.

2.2 PHASE TWO: Writing the Report

The program faculty, in consultation with the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review and OIRA, complete the Program Review Report Template (under separate cover), submitting an electronic copy to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, who then sends an electronic copy to the chair of the program review committee. For non-accredited programs, the external reviewer also completes her or his report and submits it to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review. Programs should allot at least one month prior to submission of the final report for the department chair and dean to review the final draft (see Table One for “The Program Review General Timeline”). Prior to submission to the director, the department chair and/or the program director, all full-time faculty teaching in the program, and the school/college dean sign the final draft of the Program Review Report. Signatures from the faculty and the dean signify a working knowledge of the program review findings but do not authorize the review as approved. Studies councils are the bodies authorized to approve program reviews, after which the dean will provide an official response with a Memorandum of Understanding (see Phase Four).

2.3 PHASE THREE: Reviewing and Evaluating the Report

Upon receipt of the finished and signed report (as well as the External Reviewer Report), the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review ensures that a copy has been received by the members of the PRC so they can evaluate the quality of the report. Interim requests for edits by the PRC are made in a timely fashion (see Section 1.4). Once final edits are made, the PRC completes the Program Review Committee Report (Appendix A), attaches the Rubric for Assessing Program Review Reports (Appendix B), and presents its findings back to the program faculty. It then makes a recommendation to the appropriate council whether or not to accept the report.

The council votes on the recommendation of the PRC, thereby making a final decision on the program review, and minutes reflecting action on the program review are forwarded to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review and the Senate. Once council approval is acquired, all updated materials are forwarded to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, who then forwards the materials and the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding to the dean for an official response (see Phase Four below).

2.4 PHASE FOUR: Responding to the Findings of Program Review

After the Program Review Report is completed and approved by the appropriate council, an administrative response and Memorandum of Understanding process is initiated.

The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review forwards completed and approved program reviews, with the PRC Report, and attaches a copy of the Administrative Response (Appendix C), and Memorandum of Understanding (Appendix D) to the dean of the school/college undergoing review. The dean meets with the program undergoing review to discuss findings and then responds with written feedback and budget allocations (as appropriate) for accomplishing the program goals, with recommended action steps. As appropriate, the dean incorporates program goals into the school’s/college’s strategic plan so that long-term resource needs are addressed as part of the budgeting process. The dean returns her or his completed Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review for further dissemination.
Following the dean's response, the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review forwards fully executed copies to the dean, department chair, and program director of the program undergoing review.

Responses from the dean are sent to the appropriate vice provost so that they may be considered by The Administrative Cabinet (TAC) when making long-term academic resource allocations, and decisions by TAC are communicated back to the dean.

2.5 PHASE FIVE: Reporting on the Progress of the Review

On behalf of the appropriate PRC, the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review initiates and facilitates the Mid-Cycle Status Report process. Assuming that interim deadlines are met by all parties involved during the academic year of review, Mid-Cycle Status Reports are due at the conclusion of the fall semester that falls 3 years after initial reports are written and 2.5 years after they are reviewed by the administration. This gives programs two academic years to start implementing changes and six months to evaluate the effectiveness of those changes.

The primary purpose for the Mid-Cycle Status Report is to describe the short-term progress made in implementing the identified program goals with recommended action steps and to re-visit the administrative response. The department completes the Mid-Cycle Status Report (Appendix H) and submits it to the dean for a response and signature. Once the dean has responded, the Mid-Cycle Status Report is sent to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, who forwards the document to the PRC chair.

The PRC reviews and comments on the Mid-Cycle Status Report. If the report is acceptable, this fact appears in the PRC’s minutes sent forward to the appropriate council for approval, and the report is filed with the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review. The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review also distributes the report to the chair of the PRC and to the department chair and program director of the program submitting the report.

As a part of the ongoing process of assessment, all academic programs continue to assess student learning outcomes and engage in strategic planning on an annual basis via the program’s TaskStream account. These annual processes serve to inform the next program review.

3. Components of the Program Review Report

The following is a brief overview of the components required in the Program Review Report. These components meet WASC criteria as identified in the WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review (2009) and represent best practices in higher education assessment. Programs are not expected to have fully achieved maximum quality for all the components, but instead, the review should address each component with a thorough, evidence-based, and accurate analysis.

The overall structure of the Program Review Report is articulated below but does not contain all the elements required of programs. The Program Review Report Template is available under separate cover and must be used as the basis for the document provided by each program under review.

3.1 Cover Sheet, Faculty/Dean Verification and Table of Contents

The report starts with an identifying cover sheet, followed by a verification page with faculty and dean signatures and a table of contents, identifying the starting location of each major component.

3.2 Response to the Components

Programs will utilize multiple years of program data to evaluate the quality with which their program operates as it relates to each of eight components, briefly described below. (See Program Review Report Template for the full description of program review components.)
NOTE: The information for the data exhibits identified in Components B-E will be provided to the fullest extent possible by the OIRA, in the form of a completed table, which may be inserted into your report. Data collection for faculty and student enrollment will end by November 1 for faculty and October 15 for students of the year prior to the submission of the report. Programs may choose to update data beyond November 1 or October 15 of the year prior to the submission of the report. Data collection for student completion, GPA, and class size will end by June 30 of the year prior to the submission of the report. Programs may need to supplement the tables with information unavailable to the OIRA. In such cases, programs must specify collection methods and dates (or date ranges).

Component A - Context and Mission
Programs will describe where the program fits within the university structure (e.g, school/dept.) and what degrees or concentrations it grants. The program's mission and purpose, and how it helps to fulfill the broader mission of APU will be discussed. Trends in higher education as they relate to the need for the program will be identified. Evidence collected from the last program review (or the program's inception), as well as the strategic planning process, will be described and evaluated as a context for beginning the current review.

Component B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications
Programs will evaluate the academic preparation and qualifications of faculty who teach in the program, as well the scholarly accomplishments that have contributed to program quality. Teaching effectiveness across delivery systems will be evaluated in light of the faculty development opportunities and mentoring available to faculty. Distribution of workload and course distribution across faculty classification will be analyzed in terms of overall program effectiveness.

Component C – Student Enrollment and Success
Programs will evaluate the program’s ability to attract students who fit the program mission and who successfully graduate from the program. Student and alumni accomplishments will be identified as indicators of program success, and enrollment trends will be discussed as they relate to successful recruitment and retention. Programs will evaluate the effectiveness of services they provide to facilitate student success.

Component D – Academic Opportunities and Class Size
Using data provided, programs will evaluate the size of their classes and the use of special study options available to students and will discuss how each impacts program quality.

Component E – Student and Constituent Feedback
Programs will report any data and feedback that have been provided from students, alumni and/or supervisors as to the program’s ability to prepare successful graduates. Additionally, the program will discuss ways in which student, alumni, and supervisor feedback is utilized in the assessment of program quality, as well as the program’s effectiveness at communicating and responding to the results discovered during program review.

Component F – Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning
A thorough analysis of the curriculum requirements and the degree to which the curriculum adequately and thoroughly addresses program student learning outcomes is required in this section. Programs will evaluate their effectiveness at communicating outcomes to students and involving them in the assessment process and will also evaluate the effectiveness of their assessment cycle to improve student learning.

Component G – Faith Integration
Programs will identify the support and assistance provided to both students and faculty so that they develop an appropriate understanding of how the Christian faith interacts with the discipline. Programs will evaluate evidence of adequate progress toward these goals.
Component H – Resources and Institutional Capacities
Programs will engage in a resource and capacity analysis as it relates to use of past resources, as well as resources still needed by the program. Budget trends will also be analyzed.

3.3 Summary Conclusions, Program Goals with Recommended Action Steps

The process of identifying program goals is the culminating phase of academic program review and the starting point for the next review period. Its purpose is to identify an action plan in such a way that progress toward implementing the plan can be assessed for the next round of program review. Programs will provide summary conclusions as to the program’s areas of strength and need for improvement based on the program review and will identify specific goals with recommendations for making necessary change. Recommendations will include an associated action or outcome that needs to occur in order to meet the goal. The dean will respond to this analysis.

3.4 Appendices

The following appendices are required as attachments to the program review. Others may be added as necessary.
- Program Goals with Recommended Action Steps from prior Program Review Report
- Mid-Cycle Status Report
- Administrative Response to Program Goals and Memorandum of Understanding from prior Program Review Report
- Overall Multi-year Assessment Plan from TaskStream
- Annual Assessment Reports (since the last program review) from TaskStream
- Strategic Plan and Status Reports Since Last Review

3.5 External Reviewer Report

Non-accredited programs must utilize an external reviewer who evaluates the program as a supplement to the PRC (see Section 1.7 for more detail). The external reviewer’s report (see Appendix D) must be submitted to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review, which forwards the report to the PRC reviewing the program.

3.6 Program Review Committee Report with Rubric

PRC members will complete a report (see Appendix A) and utilize a rubric (see Appendix B) to communicate the overall quality of the program review. After reporting its findings and recommendations to the program faculty, the PRC will forward its recommendation to the Studies Council for official action on the program review.

3.7 Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding

Once approved through faculty governance processes, the dean will respond by completing the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding (see Appendix C and D), providing an analysis of resources available to accomplish program recommendations.

3.8 Mid-Cycle Status Report

Programs complete a brief report, updating progress made toward achieving program recommendations. The Mid-Cycle Status Report is typically due 3 years following an approved program review report and is reviewed by the dean and PRC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE ONE: Preparing for Review</th>
<th>November 1</th>
<th>Programs scheduled for upcoming review are notified by the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review and begin working with programs to collect alumni data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring semester prior to Program Review</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Members of OIRA and the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review meets with the department chair/program director to determine needs, communicate expectations, and provided all available university data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASES TWO through FOUR: Preparing and Approving the Report; Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Department/program selects and receives approval for hiring an external reviewer (if applicable). Department begins organizing for program review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The academic year in which the Program Review is completed</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Program faculty provides materials to external reviewer and completes the Program Review Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Programs should allow at least one month prior to December 15 for dean’s review. Program Review Report, with dean’s signature, is submitted to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review; report is distributed to the members of PRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>PRC examines the report and the external reviewer’s report, asks for interim-level edits (when necessary) and reports its findings to the program. PRC then makes a recommendation (accept or not accept) to the associated council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Council votes on recommendation to accept or not accept and records its actions in the council minutes, which are approved and forwarded to the Senate and the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE FIVE: Mid-Cycle Status Report and Continuous Assessments</td>
<td>Two years following report approval</td>
<td>The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review sends finalized materials to dean for the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding. Dean meets with program to discuss findings, potential resource allocations, and completes Memorandum of Understanding. Program reviews are referenced by academic administration in future budgeting discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Program Review</td>
<td>December 15 (3 years following review)</td>
<td>Programs continue to assess student learning outcomes and engage in strategic planning annually. Programs implement recommendations with action steps and assess the effectiveness of program changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programs submit a Mid-Cycle Status Report identifying progress made toward achieving program goals, as well as any challenges that still remain. Dean and PRC reviews and responds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
Program Review Committee Report

Name of Program Reviewed: ______________________________

Directions to Program Review Committee: In the table below, comment on the quality of responses given by the program for each component, the appropriateness of goals and action steps identified by the program and any recommendations for the program to consider in its Mid-Cycle Status Report. Provide feedback that is evaluative and clear. This report will be sent to the program as part of the feedback loop prior to final vote by the council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of Report</th>
<th>Score from rubric (please attach rubric)</th>
<th>PRC response to analysis provided by program (comment in terms of the criteria in the rubric)</th>
<th>PRC response to program goals and action steps identified in this component. Include additional recommendations for program improvement that should be addressed in Mid-Cycle Status Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Mission and Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Student Enrollment and Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Academic Opportunities and Class Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Student and Constituent Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F – Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Faith Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - Resources and Institutional Capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Conclusions and Overall Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional feedback or concerns from PRC regarding program review:

Commendations from PRC:

Final recommendation of Program Review Committee (circle one): accept  do not accept
Date: __________

Vote by council to (circle one): approve  deny program review
Date: __________
## Appendix B

### RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING A PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT
(Refer to Section 1.4 for guidelines for appropriate use of rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Component</th>
<th>Initial 1</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developed 3</th>
<th>Highly Developed 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Mission and Context</td>
<td>Missing or vague mission statement. Fails to link program mission to APU. Inadequate justification for program existence and/or failure to address program changes since last review. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Functional mission statement; contains abstract language or ideas that are hard to assess but generally linked to APU mission. Superficial discussion of trends related to program demand. Incomplete discussion of changes since last review. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Good mission statement that is linked to APU mission. Solid discussion of program trends in higher education. Thorough discussion of changes since last program review. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Well-crafted mission; clear and succinct and visibly linked to APU mission. Thorough and educated discussion of program trends in higher education. Complete assessment of changes since last program review. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications</td>
<td>Missing most or all information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and/or workloads. Teaching effectiveness data missing; failure to address faculty resources or faculty needs. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Includes some information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads. Addresses teaching effectiveness and faculty resources, but an incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Nearly all information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads is included. Data and analysis of teaching effectiveness provided but not clearly linked to resources/mentoring. Good analysis</td>
<td>All information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads is included. Data and analysis of teaching effectiveness provided, along with thorough discussion of faculty resources and faculty needs. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Student Enrollment and Success</td>
<td>Missing most or all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment missing or incomplete. No mention of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Missing analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Includes some demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment exists but is incomplete and not evidence-based. Brief mention of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Incomplete analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Includes nearly all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment is discussed but not exceptionally documented. Thorough discussion of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Good analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Includes all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment is well-documented and discussed. Thorough discussion of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Thorough and thoughtful analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Academic Opportunities and Class Size</td>
<td>Missing most or all information on special study options, class size, and/or non-credit courses. Little or no evaluation of how study options and class size impact program quality. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Includes some information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses, but no evidence-based discussion of impact on program quality. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Includes nearly all information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses. Solid discussion of impact on program quality. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Includes all information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses. Evidence-based discussion of impact on program quality. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Fractional scores (e.g., 2.7, 3.5, etc.) are acceptable but not required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Component</th>
<th>Initial 1</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developed 3</th>
<th>Highly Developed 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Student and Constituent Feedback</td>
<td>Missing most or all information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys. No mention of acquiring supervisor assessments. No apparent effort to include students in program review. No discussion of budgetary trends. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Some references to information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, but limited or no use of supervisor assessments. Recognition of need to include students in program review, but efforts to date are minimal. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Good discussion of information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, and solid attempt to utilize supervisor assessments. Some processes in place for including students in program review. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Excellent discussion of information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, as well as systems for utilizing supervisor assessments. Systematic processes in place for including students in program review. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning</td>
<td>Incomplete overview of course offerings. No mention of alignment with comparable programs. No curriculum map or discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Little to no assessment of curriculum effectiveness or process used to assess curriculum. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Provides an overview of course offerings and degree requirements with limited references to comparable programs. Incomplete curriculum map and limited discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Limited discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Provides an overview of course offerings and degree requirements and discusses alignment with comparable programs. Includes a curriculum map and thoughtful discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Good analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Provides an overview of course offerings and degree requirements and engages in a thorough discussion of how program aligns with comparable programs. Includes a curriculum map and thoughtful discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Excellent analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Faith Integration</td>
<td>Missing most or all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and/or evidence of faith integration among students. No data from IDEA provided or discussed. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Includes nearly all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and evidence of faith integration among students. Limited reference to data from IDEA, but an incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Includes nearly all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and evidence of faith integration among students. Solid discussion of IDEA results and other sources of evidence. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Includes all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and faith integration among students. Excellent analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Resources and Institutional Capacities</td>
<td>Fail to discuss adequacy of library resources or needs around information literacy. No substantive analysis of efforts toward resource acquisition or evidence-based need for new capacities. No discussion of budget trends. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Minimal discussion of library and information literacy needs. Mention of resources acquired but lacks a thorough analysis of need for new capacities. No meaningful discussion of budgetary trends. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Solid discussion of library and information literacy needs. Good discussion of resources acquired and reasonable analysis of need for new capacities. Budgetary trends are discussed. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Excellent discussion of library and information literacy needs. Thorough discussion of resources acquired and excellent, evidence-based analysis of need for new capacities. Budgetary trends are thoughtfully and thoroughly analyzed. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record comments in PRC Report

Score _____

Score _____

Score _____

Score _____

Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Component</th>
<th>Initial 1</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developed 3</th>
<th>Highly Developed 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions, Goal Setting with Recommended Action Steps</td>
<td>Missing a summary of strengths and weaknesses generated from program review. Goals are ambiguous and action steps are unattainable. Inadequate analysis.</td>
<td>Includes a brief summary of strengths and weaknesses but still superficial. Goals are adequate but not evidence-based and action steps are not clear or attainable. Incomplete analysis.</td>
<td>Includes a thorough discussion of strengths and weaknesses. Goals are reasonable and attainable and action steps make sense. Good analysis.</td>
<td>Excellent and articulate discussion of strengths and weaknesses. Goals are clearly linked to program improvement and are reasonable. Action steps are clear. Excellent, insightful analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record comments in PRC Report

Score _____
Appendix C
Administrative Response

(Attach this year’s Administrative Response Sheet as Template Appendix B for your program’s next program review.)

Program: ___________________________ School/College: __________________________

Date Approved by the Program Review Committee: __________________________

DEAN’S RESPONSE TO GOALS* - In the Dean’s column in the table below, respond with feedback to each goal and, when appropriate, identify any resources that are available or any form of assistance you can provide for accomplishing a program goal. After meeting with program faculty to discuss your response, please return this form, and accompanying Memorandum of Understanding to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Goal or Desired Outcome to Improve Program Quality (copy or summarize from program report)</th>
<th>Program’s Recommended Action Steps to Achieve Goal (copy or summarize from program report)</th>
<th>Program’s Request for Resources with Justification (include costs and rationale)</th>
<th>Priority of Resource Allocation (High, Medium, Low.)</th>
<th>Anticipated Impact on Educational Effectiveness</th>
<th>Dean’s Response to Goals (see instructions above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* If a Program Goal is a request for a new program initiative, contact the Office of Curricular Support (OCS)

Additional Comments from Dean on these Goals and Recommended Action Steps:

DEAN’S ANALYSIS OF RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS: In the space below, using data from Exhibits B.7, C.1, D.2, and H.3 and annual strategic planning reports, analyze current resource allocations for this program in light of enrollment trends and/or revenues.

To what degree are requests for new positions or space justified by increased enrollments (C.1)?

Does the faculty/student ratio (B.7) and average class size (D.2) justify the need for more resources?

What evidence is provided to indicate that resources will impact the educational effectiveness of this program?

How do the requests noted relate to the shared vision 2022, the Academic Vision 2012, and your school/or college strategic plan?

Dean’s Signature:________________________________________________ Date:____________________

*UPON COMPLETING THIS RESPONSE SHEET, please make a copy for your records and then return this original immediately to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review

DATE RECEIVED BACK to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review: __________________________

Program Chair/Director Signature:________________________________________ Date:____________________

DATE RECEIVED BACK to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review: __________________________
Appendix D
Memorandum of Understanding

Program: ________________________ School/College: ____________________________

Date Review Approved by the Program Review Committee: __________________________

Date of Meeting Between Dean and Program Faculty: _______________________________

Dean's Commendations:

Dean's Recommendations:

Dean's Commitment to Resources and/or Support Allocation:

Dean's Signature: ____________________________ Date: __________________________

Program Chair/Director Signature: ____________________________ Date: __________________________

*UPON COMPLETING THIS MOU, please make a copy for your records and then return this original immediately to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review

DATE RECEIVED BACK to the Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review: ____________________________
Appendix E
External Reviewer Request and Authorization Form

Name of Program Undergoing Review: _________________________________________
Name and Title of Proposed Reviewer: ________________________________
Current Place of Employment: ______________________________________________

Provide a brief biographical statement that clearly indicates the qualifications of the reviewer. Please also attach an updated vita.

Explain any prior or current relationship with the program and/or program faculty/students that may create a conflict of interest (e.g., has the reviewer previously taught for APU? Is he/she currently involved in a business or professional relationship with a member of the program? Are there other professional/personal relationships between any member of the program and the proposed reviewer?)

Projected Expenses: Identify with detail the projected expenses for utilizing this reviewer (Note: whenever possible, a qualified local reviewer and a one-day site visit is preferred):

Travel:
Meals:
Stipend:
Other:

Submitted by: _____________________________________________
(Name and title of faculty making request)

Approved by: _____________________________________________
(Department chair)

Approved by: _____________________________________________
(Dean)

Approved by: _____________________________________________
(Provost)

Funding amount approved by Provost: $________________________

Return this completed form to the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review will send a completed copy to the Provost and will initiate the hiring of the external reviewer.
Appendix F – External Reviewer Professional Services Agreement

AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
Office of the Provost
(Herein referred to as APU)

EXTERNAL REVIEWER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT
A completed W-9 must accompany this form

You can find the W-9 form at the following Link: http://www.apu.edu/live_data/files/184/w9_request_tin_certification.pdf

External Reviewer:

SSN or Fed I.D. #:

Street Address:

Department:

City, ST, Zip:

APU Account #:

Contract Start Date:

Contract End Date:

Contract Amount:

Description of Service:

External Program Review

1. Engagement of External Reviewer. APU hereby engages External Reviewer and External Reviewer hereby agrees that during the Term of this Agreement External Reviewer shall provide reviewing of program consistent with the APU Program Review Handbook and including but not limited to the constructive evaluation of the Program Review Report submitted by the program faculty. The External Reviewer may choose, but is not required, to conduct a site visit as part of the review. The External Reviewer must provide within ten (10) working days of the site visit or the receipt of a Program Review Report (whichever occurs last) a written evaluation of the program using the guidelines provided and attached hereto.

2. Compensation. APU shall pay External Reviewer for services for the contract amount set forth above. Such compensation shall be paid in semimonthly installments on the 1st and 16th of each month within the parameters of the above given contract dates. At the end of the calendar year, APU will issue an IRS Form 1099 to Professional, and External Reviewer shall be responsible for making all required tax payments.

3. Independent Contractor Status; Authority. The relationship of External Reviewer to APU is that of an independent contractor, and not an agent, servant or employee of APU. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to imply that External Reviewer or its agents or employees are officers or employees of APU. External Reviewer shall not be authorized to enter into any contracts, agreements or understandings on behalf of APU without the prior written consent of APU except as specifically provided for herein.

4. Confidentiality. In connection with the consulting relationship established pursuant to the terms of this Agreement, External Reviewer may have access to non-public information regarding University and its students. External Reviewer agrees to keep such non-public information confidential, and shall not, without the prior written consent of the APU Office of the Provost, disclose such information in any manner whatsoever, in whole or in part, or use such information other than in connection with the performance of external reviewing services pursuant to this Agreement. Promptly, upon completion or termination of this Agreement, all copies of the confidential information will be returned to APU or destroyed upon the request of APU.

5. Governing Law and Jurisdiction. This Agreement shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. Each of the parties hereto consents to such jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Agreement and matters pertaining to the transaction and activities contemplated hereby.

6. Complete Agreement. This Agreement supersedes any and all agreements, either oral or in writing, between External Reviewer and APU with respect to the subject matter contained herein. Each party to this Agreement acknowledges that no representations, inducements, promises or agreements, oral or otherwise, have been made by either party and that no oral agreements or understandings between the parties shall be binding upon them.

7. Compliance with APU Policies. External Reviewer agrees to abide by the policies and behavioral standards of APU, as indicated in the APU Employee Handbook, APU Faculty Handbook, and APU Adjunct Handbook, indicating their understanding and acceptance of such standards.

Print Name of External Reviewer

Date

Signature of External Reviewer

Date

Department Chair Approval

Date

Dean’s Approval

Date

APU Provost Approval

Date

1 Any External Reviewer who is a non-resident of California must complete a Withholding Exemption Certificate http://www.apu.edu/live_data/files/184/ca_form_590.pdf
EXTERNAL REVIEWER REPORT
Prepared by: [insert name and title]
[insert institution]

For [insert name of program being reviewed]

Completed on: [insert date]

Note: The following pages constitute the template for all External Reviewer Reports. Do not change the order or the wording of any items and respond where indicated. External Reviewers may request additional information from departments or programs in order to complete their analysis of the program.
## Routing of the Program Review External Reviewer Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEM</th>
<th>DATE ACTION OCCURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ In the spring prior to the review, once approvals have been obtained,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program sends the external reviewer a professional services agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the external reviewer report template.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No later than December 15, the program director submits their program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review report and any additional documents to the external reviewer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Within two weeks of receipt of the program’s materials, the reviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reads the materials and may complete a campus visit (extensions may be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granted if timeframe encompasses a university holiday).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Within two weeks of the campus visit, the external reviewer forwards an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic copy of the report to the Director of Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Program Review in CTLA and to the program director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review forwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the report to the Program Review Committee chair. The PRC reviews the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviewer Report and incorporates its findings into their PRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ After the program review has been approved by the council, The Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review sends final Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Report, the PRC Report &amp; scoring Rubric, the External Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report, the Administrative Response, and the Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to deans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review keeps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copies of all program review materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Contents

External Reviewer Response to Components

Component A - Mission and Context
Component B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications
Component C - Student Enrollment and Success
Component D - Academic Opportunities and Class Size
Component E - Student and Constituent Feedback
Component F – Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning
Component G - Faith Integration
Component H – Resources and Institutional Capacities
Summary Conclusions

Response to Program Goals with Recommended Action Steps
Component A - Context and Mission
Please review and evaluate the program’s mission and purpose. Discuss the need for the program within the context of higher education and evaluate its apparent contribution to the academy and society at large. Where appropriate, identify ways for the program to improve its relevancy.

[Respond Here]

Component B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications
Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the quality and quantity of faculty associated with the program. Identify any needs related to faculty that impact delivery of a high-quality program, and identify any gaps or weaknesses that should be addressed.

[Respond Here]

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master’s, doctoral). Where appropriate, suggest improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality of scholarship produced by the faculty.

[Respond Here]

Component C – Student Enrollment and Success
Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program’s recruitment and retention efforts as it relates to enrolling and graduating students who fit the mission of the program. Identify any areas in need of improvement for producing successful students, especially as it relates to meeting the needs of diverse learners.

[Respond Here]

Component D: Academic Opportunities and Class Size
Using the evidence provided, discuss the trends in the program’s class sizes and, if relevant, the impact on student learning and program effectiveness. When applicable, comment on areas in need of improvement as it relates to academic opportunities provided by the program.

[Respond Here]

Component E – Student and Constituent Feedback
Analyze the department/program’s overall effectiveness at utilizing student, alumni, and supervisor feedback as part of the assessment process. How well does the program solicit and respond to feedback, as well as communicate results of program review to its constituents, especially its current students? In what ways can the program improve in its use of constituent feedback?

[Respond Here]
Component F – Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning
After reviewing the program’s curricular offerings, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program’s curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any needed changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

[Respond Here]

After reviewing the Multi-year Overall Assessment Plan of the program, please evaluate the quality of the plan, including the appropriateness of the evidence used to assess student outcomes. Comment on any areas needing improvement related to outcomes assessment.

[Respond Here]

Component G – Faith Integration
Evaluate the program’s commitment to the integration of faith and learning. When appropriate, identify areas in need of improvement.

[Respond Here]

Component H – Resources and Institutional Capacities
Comment on the internal and external resource allocations provided to the program, including University resources that support the program (e.g., University library, financial aid, student or faculty housing, etc.), as it relates to the program’s enrollment trends and growth projections. In what ways can the program better allocate or acquire resources?

[Respond Here]

Summary Conclusions and Response to Program’s Goals and Recommended Action Steps
Respond to the summary conclusions provided by the program and identify any additional findings from your own analysis of the program. Include a response to the program’s goals and recommended action steps, identifying any additions or modifications that you deem appropriate to that list. Feel free to add any comments that further clarify your assessment of the program.

[Respond Here]
Appendix H
Program Review
Mid-Cycle Status Report
(to be completed by December 15, 3 years after initial writing of Program Review Report)

Program Name:

Date Program Review Report was Approved by Council:

Date Mid-Cycle Status Report Submitted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Goal or Desired Outcome to Improve Program Quality. (will be copied from original program review; include PRC recommendations)</th>
<th>Recommended Action Steps to Achieve Goal (copy from original program review report or strategic plan; include PRC recommendations)</th>
<th>Dean’s Initial Response to Goals (from original program review or strategic plan)</th>
<th>Evidence or Outcome used to Evaluate Progress (what data are you using to make your judgment?)</th>
<th>Progress Made Toward Accomplishing Goal (be detailed when possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRC’s Recommendations from Original Program Review:

Additional Comments from Dean from Original Program Review:

RESPONSES:

Program Faculty Summary Conclusions: Evaluate how well the program is moving forward on its program goals, and identify any remaining challenges associated with accomplishing the recommendations from the original program review.

Dean’s Response: In the space below, comment on the progress being made by the program and indicate any further considerations or concerns. Identify any actions necessary to support the program’s achievement of its goals.

Dean’s Analysis of Resource Allocations from Program Review Memorandum of Understanding. Evaluate the program’s use of resources provided in the original MOU. What adjustments are necessary based on the program’s progress?

Dean’s Supplemental Response to MOU. Include any new commitments made as a result of this status report:

I have read and responded to this document: _______________________________ Signature of Dean Date

Program Review Committee Response: In the space below, comment on the progress being made by the program and indicate any further considerations or concerns.

Accepted by the Undergraduate, Masters, or Doctoral (circle one) Program Review Committee

PRC Chair: _______________________________ Date: __________
PROGRAM REVIEW – A periodic event, usually every seven years, completed by academic departments/programs that includes assessment results plus other critical elements related to educational effectiveness.

1. In the fall, prior to a scheduled review, programs are notified and given opportunity for input on their Alumni Survey. Alumni Survey is sent out before Christmas.

2. In the spring, programs meet with OIRA and CTLA team and are provided with their data. Non-accredited programs select and receive authorization for an external reviewer.

3. A completed Program Review Report is submitted by the program faculty to The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review and the corresponding Program Review Committee (PRC).

4. The PRC reviews the report, requests interim edits, responds with a report and presentation of findings to the program faculty and makes a final recommendation to the Council.

5. The Council takes action on PRC recommendations and communicates its action to the Senate.

6. Once approved, The Director of Student Learning Assessment and Program Review forwards the program review materials to the Dean for a face-to-face meeting and a written Administrative Response with Memorandum of Understanding.

7. The department or program begins working toward accomplishing short-term goals.

8. During their quarterly strategic planning meetings, the Administrative Cabinet utilizes program reviews for prioritizing the academic budget and sends recommendations to The Administrative Cabinet at the appropriate time in the budget development process.

9. Decisions regarding long-term resource allocation are communicated to the appropriate Dean and department or program.

10. 3 years after completing its program review report, program faculty submit a Mid-Cycle Status Report commenting on progress made toward goal completion. The report is routed to the Dean and PRC for response.