|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department is expected to address Part 1-5** | **Exemplary**4 | **Meets Expectations**3 | **Partially Meets Expectations**2 | **Does Not Meet Expectations**1 |
| **Part 1a: Purpose Statement** Centrality of the department to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution | Department/Unit purpose is clearly defined, and is in direct alignment with university mission, and the narrative ties the purpose, university mission, and roles together.  | Department/Unit purpose is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned. | Department/Unit purpose is generally stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected.  | Department/Unit purpose is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission. |
| **Part 1b.** **Relationship to University Mission** | Each program’s support of the university mission is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative tie the program support and university mission together. | Each program’s support of the university mission is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the university mission, specific examples are not provided. | Each program’s support of the university mission is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is stated but not connected. | Each program’s support of the university mission is not stated. |
| **Part 1c. Relationship to Strategic Plan:** Centrality of each program to supporting the university strategic plan | Each program’s support of the university strategic plan is clearly defined, and specific examples in the narrative tie the program support and strategic plan together. | Each program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The connection of the plan and the program’s support is in general aligned to the strategic plan, specific examples are not provided. | Each program’s support of the university strategic plan is provided in the narrative. The role of the program and relationship to the strategic plan is stated but not connected. | Each program’s support of the university strategic plan is not stated. |
| **Part 2 Faculty Quality and Productivity:** Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty | The document *clearly reflects* that faculty members are fully qualified to support each program in the department, specifically the goals, inclusive of departmental standards and in keeping with the university priorities in this area, for example, FAR and UNISCOPE. Productivity is directly linked to program enhancements with explicit narrative provided. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with each program in the department are *fully qualified* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements and is somewhat addressed in the narrative. | The document reflects that the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty associated with each program in the department are *sufficient* to sustain the program.The document reflects productivity is linked to program enhancements but is not addressed in the narrative. | Faculty productivity and quality *are not evaluated as sufficient* to meet the needs of each program in the department.Productivity is not directly linked to program enhancements. |
| **Part 3 Academic Program(s) and Emphasis**: Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students | The assessment plan for each program is fully implemented and clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. Measures and populations are clearly explained and integrated into the program.  | The assessment plan for each program, is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning but does not address the positive impact of the curriculum on student learning. | The assessment plan for each program is partially implemented and attempts to show the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning. | The assessment plan for each program does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning. |
| **Part 4 Enrollment Management**  |
| **Part 4A. Student Need/Employer Demand:** Demonstrated student need and employer demand for each program in the department/unit | The department/unit clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need, student demand, and the national job outlook for each program offered.  | The department/unit clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand for each program offered. | The department/unit presents data that shows either employer demand or student need for each program offered. | The department/unit data does not indicate student need nor employer demand for each program offered. |
| **Part 4.B. Recruitment/Retention:** Department/Unit in supporting the GEM and/or SEM Plan | The department/unit clearly demonstrates its progress made on the GEM and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 3 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the GEM and/or SEM Plan. | The department/unit demonstrates its progress made on the GEM and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 2 activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the GEM and/or SEM Plan. | The department/unit demonstrates its progress made on the GEM and/or SEM plan and provide narrative for at least 1 activity undertaken in the department to support the goals of the GEM and/or SEM Plan. | The department/unit does not demonstrate its progress made on the GEM and/or SEM plan or provide narrative on activities undertaken in the department to support the goals of the GEM and/or SEM Plan. |
| **Part 4.C Program Service:** Service the department/unit provides to the discipline, the university and beyond  | The department/unit demonstrates its value with noted exemplary service to the discipline, to the university, and beyond.  | The department/unit demonstrates value to two of the following: the discipline, the university, or beyond. | The department/unit demonstrates value to one of the following: discipline, the university or beyond. | The department/unit does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university, or beyond. |
| **Part 5: Summary/ Recommendations:** Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement | The department/unit has made changes based on the data and has systematically studied the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement because of the feedback loop. | The department/unit regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen. | The department/unit makes limited use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. | The department/unit makes no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Degrees Offered: |  |
|  |  |
| Evidence of Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations:  |  |
|  |  |
| Committee Notes for current review: |  |
| Commendations of Program:  |  |
| Recommendations by Program Review Committee going forward: |  |
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University Program Review Committee recommendation (Internal Follow-up), if any:

Resubmit with focus on Targeted area(s) circled below (e.g. SMART Goals, additional data/narrative)

Recommendations/Feedback:

(1) Market demand for the program(s);

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program(s) to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program(s) as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program(s) provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) Cost‐effectiveness of programs offered in department/unit

Program Review Meets Expectations in all 6 areas of focus:

(1) Market demand for the program(s)

(2) Student demand, student accessibility, and student return on investment;

(3) Centrality of the program(s) to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution;

(4) The quality of the program(s) as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;

(5) The service the program(s) provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and

(6) Cost‐effectiveness of programs offered in department/unit

Quantitative Minimum Criteria

* Criteria for Number of Majors (Student Demand)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 25 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 20 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of five or more
* Criteria for Number of Graduates (Degree Production)
* Baccalaureate programs, four-year average of 10 or more
* Master’s programs. Four-year average of 5 or more
* Doctoral, four-year average of two or more
* Talent Pipeline
* 51% or more graduates employed in Region within 1 year (four-year average)
* Student Return on Investment - Baccalaureate programs
* 2022 Five-Year Post-Graduation Median Salary $38,050 or more (280% or more of 2022 poverty level).