|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary**  | ***Thorough***  | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *The executive summary highlights major, significant changes that occurred over the 5-year review period.*  | Provides a detailed, comprehensive, descriptive summary.  | Provides a general summary. misses a few minor details | Does not provide a summary describing any changes.  |
| **Program Mission and Goals** | ***Thorough*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *The department’s mission has been updated, clearly articulates what the program aims to accomplish, who it serves, and what distinguishes it. The mission has been updated in TaskStream and on the department’s website.* | The mission is clear: it indicates who the department serves, what the program aims to achieve, and what distinguishes it from peer programs. It is consistent in all printed and electronic sources.  | The mission clearly articulates what the program aims to accomplish. However, what is stated on the website is different from what the department identifies in its report.  | The mission is not a mission statement, but rather a list of what the program aims to accomplish or a lengthy description about the discipline. |
| *The program’s goals are clearly articulated and aligned to the program’s mission.*  | Goals are specific, clearly articulated, and consonant with both the program and institutional missions.  | Learning goals too broad and vaguely worded; operational goals are a series of action steps or checklist items.  | There are learning goals, but the department does not appear to have operational goals to measure its effectiveness.  |
| *There is a clear, participatory process by which goals are developed, adopted, and revised* | There is a detailed outline of the program’s process for developing, adopting, and revising goals. | The process for developing, adopting, and revising goals is minimally outlined | There is no evidence of how the program faculty develop, adopt, and revise goals. |
| **Curriculum** | ***Thorough***  | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *The curriculum map shows how the required courses are properly sequenced and sufficient enough for students to achieve 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.  | The curriculum map does not indicate an obvious sequence of courses or scaffolding of curriculum; too few required courses align with the learning goals.  | There is no curriculum map.  |
| *There is a clear description of the curriculum changes that occurred during the review period and what informed these changes.*  | The report provides a clear discussion of the changes made over the review period, and provides evidence supporting these changes.  | The report indicates the curriculum changes, but does not identify the reasons these changes were made. | There is no discussion of curriculum changes made during the review period.  |
| *There is adequate evidence that shows the department provides quality experiential learning opportunities that enrich the student experience.*  | The department offers students a rich educational experience by offering quality experiential learning and co-curricular opportunities that are regularly tracked and included in program-level assessment.  | The department provides experiential learning opportunities, but these occur at random and are not tracked.  | The department does not offer any experiential or enriching co-curricular opportunities to its students. |
| **Students** | ***Thorough*** | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *There is a clear understanding of who the students are, their strengths and weaknesses, their educational needs now and in the foreseeable future.* | The program has acknowledged and incorporated the needs of the students in the design of the program, and anticipated trends in the student body. | There is some evidence that student needs are accounted for in the program. | There appears to be a disconnect between the needs of the students and the program.  |
| *The department is actively involved in recruiting and enrolling students in their major(s).*  | The department faculty participate in enrollment efforts and have formulated specific strategies to attract and retain students.  | The department faculty participate in admission events, but do not have a clear plan for enrolling or retaining students.  | The department’s faculty do not engage in efforts to recruit, enroll, or retain students. |
| **Student Learning** | ***Thorough***  | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *There is clear evidence of systematic, program-level student learning assessment.* | Clear and thorough evidence of meaningful, ongoing, and systematic evidence of all program-level learning goals. | Some evidence that the department has assessed student learning, but these efforts have not been systematic or are limited to course-level assessments. | Little to no evidence that program-level assessments have been systematically done.  |
| *Student learning assessment results are well analyzed, have been used to inform improvements, and are shared with appropriate stakeholders.*  | Clear, thoughtful analyses of assessment findings provide evidence supporting curricular decisions and other program-level improvements.  | The report identifies curricular changes, but does not provide an analysis of student learning assessment results to support these changes.  | There is no analysis of student learning results, even though results might have been reported.  |
| **Faculty** | ***Thorough***  | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *There is clear evidence that the number of faculty meet the needs of the program.* | Evidence indicates number of faculty is either satisfactory or insufficient for the needs of the program. Claims of an inadequate number of faculty have been well substantiated. Evidence indicates number of faculty appears inadequate for the needs of the program | Report indicates whether or not the number of faculty is sufficient, but the evidence is not convincing or substantial.  | Report does not provide information or evidence supporting claims regarding whether or not the number of faculty is sufficient. |
| *There is clear evidence that the faculty’s areas of expertise meet the program’s mission and goals.*  | Report outlines ideal fit between background/strength of faculty and the program. Faculty expertise will allow the program to develop its curricular and experiential offerings, if warranted.  | Evidence of some fit between background/strength of faculty and the program. | Report provides information on faculty qualifications, but does not analyze how the faculty’s expertise meets the program’s mission and goals.  |
| *There is clear evidence of teaching effectiveness in the department.*  | The department measures teaching effectiveness beyond what is required by the institution, and faculty participate in professional development opportunities related to effective, innovative pedagogy.  | The program measures teaching effectiveness, as per the College’s requirements.  | The program does not measure faculty teaching effectiveness. |
| **Resources** | ***Thorough***  | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *Technology, equipment, and space allow the program to meet the needs of the students and fulfil its mission and goals.* | The report provides compelling and convincing evidence that the resources allocated to the program are adequate/inadequate.  | The report indicated that resources are less than ideal, but does not substantiate these claims.  | The report does not provide a detailed analysis of resources and whether or not they are sufficient in helping the program achieve its mission and goals.  |
| **Overall Quality of the Review Document** | ***Thorough***  | ***Adequate*** | ***Inadequate***  |
| *Review contained a candid and deliberate picture of program strengths and weaknesses* | Strong evidence of a thorough and self-reflective review, incorporating input from key stakeholders was conducted.  | Some evidence that a real review of program strengths and weaknesses was attempted and contains some input from key stakeholders | Little to no evidence of a real review of program strengths and weaknesses or involvement of other key stakeholders. |