|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Program:*** | ***Date:*** |
| ***Program Review Elements*** |
| **Executive Summary**  | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *There is a clear, descriptive summary of the program and the major changes made during the review period.* | Does not provide a summary.  | Provides a general summary. misses a few minor details | Provides a detailed, comprehensive, descriptive summary.  |
| **Program Learning Goals** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *The program’s learning goals are clearly articulated and aligned to the program’s mission.*  | There are no stated learning goals and/or their connection to the program’s mission are unclear | Learning goals are not tailored to the program and/or are too broad and vaguely worded.  | Learning goals are specific, clearly articulated, and consonant with the program’s mission. |
| *There is a clear, participatory process by which goals are developed, adopted, and revised* | There is no evidence of how the program faculty develop, adopt, and revise goals | The process for developing, adopting, and revising goals is minimally outlined | There is a detailed outline of the program’s process for developing, adopting, and revising goals |
| **Curriculum** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *The curriculum map shows how the required courses are properly sequenced and sufficient enough for students to achieve the learning goals.*  | There is no curriculum map.  | The curriculum map does not indicate an obvious sequence of courses or scaffolding of curriculum; too few required courses align with the learning goals.  | Curriculum map shows how students progress through the curriculum from lower-level to upper-level courses; students have sufficient opportunities to achieve the program-level learning goals.  |
| *There is a clear description of the curriculum changes that occurred during the review period and what informed these changes.*  | There is no discussion of curriculum changes made during the review period.  | The report indicates the curriculum changes, but does not identify the reasons these changes were made. | The report provides a clear discussion of the changes made over the review period, and provides evidence supporting these changes.  |
| *There is a comprehensive discussion of areas of concern and/or opportunities for growth in the curriculum.*  | The report alludes to certain concerns and opportunities, but does not explore either.  | The report describes current concerns and potential opportunities, but does not offer solutions or action plans to address either.  | The report describes current concerns and potential opportunities, and considers evidence-based solutions.   |
| **Student Learning** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *There is clear evidence of systematic, program-level student learning assessment.* | Little to no evidence that program-level assessments have been systematically done.  | Some evidence that the department has assessed student learning, but these efforts have not been systematic or are limited to course-level assessments. | Clear and thorough evidence of meaningful, ongoing, and systematic evidence of all program-level learning goals. |
| *Student learning assessment results are well analyzed and have been used to inform curricular decisions.* | There is no analysis of student learning results, even though result might have been reported.  | The report identifies curricular changes, but does not provide an analysis of student learning assessment results to support these changes.  | Clear, thoughtful analyses of assessment findings provide evidence supporting curricular decisions.  |
| **Students** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *There is a clear understanding of who the students are, their strengths and weaknesses, their educational needs now and in the foreseeable future.* | There appears to be a disconnect between the needs of the students and the program as written | There is some evidence that student needs are accounted for in the program | The program has acknowledged and incorporated the needs of the students in the design of the program, and anticipated trends in the student body |
| **Faculty** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *There is clear evidence that the number of faculty meet the needs of the program.* | Evidence indicates number of faculty appears inadequate for the needs of the program | Evidence indicates number of faculty less than ideal, but adequate for the needs of the program | Evidence indicates number of faculty satisfactory for the needs of the program |
| *There is clear evidence that the background of the faculty meets the needs of the program.* | Little evidence of good fit between background/strengths of faulty and the program | Evidence of some fit between background/strength of faculty and the program | Ideal fit between background/strength of faculty and the program |
| **Program Operations** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *There is evidence of Operational Goals for the next 5 years.* | Little to no indication of any goals over the next five years. | Some indication of goals with general information regarding how they will be reached. | Clear outline of goals and plans to reach them. |
| **Resources** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *Resources are (physical, temporal, monetary, etc.) adequate to meet the needs of the students and the program* | No evidence that resources are adequate – unfilled needs are obvious | Evidence indicates resources are less than ideal, but adequate for the needs of the program | Evidence indicates that the program is adequately resourced |
| **Overall Quality of the Review Document** | ***Inadequate*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Thorough*** |
| *Review contained a candid and deliberate picture of program strengths and weaknesses* | Little to no evidence of a real review of program strengths and weaknesses or involvement of other key stakeholders | Some evidence that a real review of program strengths and weaknesses was attempted and contains some input from key stakeholders | Strong evidence of a thorough and self-reflective review, incorporating input from key stakeholders was conducted |
| *The document and appendices were organized and readable* | Document disorganized and difficult to read | Documents adequately organized and readable | Document thoroughly organized and extremely well-written |