



Program Review Manual

March 2017

Office of Academic Affairs

Table of Contents

Section	Page
A. Purpose and Overview of the Program Review Process	1
B. Roles and Responsibilities for Program Review	1
1. Program Faculty Members	1
2. Academic Department Heads	3
3. Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA).....	3
4. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and the Budget Office	3
5. Director of Assessment of Student Learning (DASL).....	3
6. Faculty Assessment Coordinator (FAC).....	3
7. Assessment Committee	4
8. Curriculum Committee(s).....	4
9. External Reviewer	4
10. Vice President for Academic Affairs.....	4
11. President	4
12. CMU Board of Trustees	4
C. Calendar of Program Review Activities	4
D. Program Review Self-study Elements	7
1. Introduction and Program Overview	7
2. Curriculum.....	7
3. Analysis of Student Demand and Success.....	7
4. Program Resources	7
5. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments	8
6. Future Program Plans	8
E. The External Review	9
1. Selection of the External Reviewer	9
2. External Reviewer's Site Visit	9
3. External Reviewer's Report	10
a. Narrative.....	10
b. Executive Summary	10
1) Tabular Form	10
2) Recommendations.....	10
F. Follow-up Processes.....	10
1. Assessment Plan	10
2. Progress (Mid-cycle) Assessment Report.....	11

List of Tables

1. CMU/WCCC Program Review Cycle	2
2. Schedule for Data Collection and Reporting of Assessment Results for Student Learning Outcomes	6
3. Executive Summary Template for External Reviewer's Observations	12

Colorado Mesa University/Western Colorado Community College Program Review Process

A. Purpose and Overview of the Program Review Process

The program review process is integral to academic planning and assessment and offers a means of gauging the quality of the academic program under review. It is an opportunity for program faculty members to reflect collaboratively on educational practices and consider the role of their program in the context of the broader array of programs offered by the University. As part of the process, faculty members should reflect upon the program's most recent directions (particularly as they relate to changes in the discipline), celebrate the program's achievements, and consider the learning outcomes of students. Program faculty members also should ensure that the academic program aligns with campus priorities, and that the results of the self-study serve as a basis for planning processes and budget requests.

Based on a six-year cycle (Table 1), each program's faculty members must complete a self-study that addresses the basic elements outlined in Section D. Disciplines offering more than one undergraduate degree will review all awards at the same time; graduate programs will be reviewed separately from undergraduate programs. A CMU program that has attained professional accreditation and/or state approval normally will be reviewed in accordance with the criteria and schedule set by the accrediting/approving agency. As part of the professional organization's self-study process, program faculty members should address the criteria articulated elsewhere in this document where possible. At a minimum, however, a program undergoing an accreditation review will be expected to submit the required CMU student learning outcomes/student success information to the University's Director of the Assessment of Student Learning at the conclusion of the self-study process as well as mid-cycle reports. See Sections D.5. and F.

B. Roles and Responsibilities for Program Review

The review process intentionally involves multiple stakeholders in assessing the program:

- Faculty members, staff, administrators, and students who are directly involved at the operational and strategic levels;
- Alumni, employers of graduates, and community members who have an interest in the program, emphasizing the importance of CMU's connections with the region; and
- A reviewer from the discipline who brings an external, peer perspective on the program.

In terms of responsibilities, each of the following make a variety of contributions in the process:

- 1. Program Faculty Members.** All program faculty members are expected to be involved in and given the opportunity to provide meaningful input to the program's self-study. In the best of circumstances, the program review document will be developed by the faculty through a fully-participatory, collegial process under the general guidance of the Academic Department Head. Review of assessment results should be a meaningful opportunity for faculty members to reflect on how teaching and learning in their program can be improved. In addition to the self-study narrative (with accompanying data and appendices), faculty members also supply relevant program documents (e.g., brochures, program sheets) and, if needed, a rejoinder to the external reviewer's report. Program faculty members also provide a current curriculum vitae for all full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty. As part of the effort to develop a follow-up assessment plan and mid-cycle report, faculty members should consider input/feedback from the Assessment and Curriculum Committees, the Director of Assessment of Student Learning, as well as the external reviewer.

Table 1. CMU/WCCC Program Review Cycle

Cycle 5	Cycle 6	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
AY 2016-2017	AY 2017-2018	AY 2018-2019	AY 2019-2020	AY 2020-2021	AY 2021-22
Accounting (BS)	Art (BFA); Anim, Film, & Mot Des (BFA)	Chemistry (BS)	Administrative Office Tech (C, AAS)	Baking & Pastry (AAS)	Business Administration (BBA/BAS)
Agriculture Science (AS); Sustainable Agri (AAS)	Business (MBA)	Construction Technology (C, AAS)	Biological Sciences (AS, BS)	Computer Information Systems (BS/BAS)	Culinary Arts (C, AAS)
Athletic Training (BS) - CAATE visit in 2017 - 18	English (BA)	Criminal Justice (BA; BAS)	Electric Lineworker (C)	Construction Management (BS)	Dance (BFA)
Certified Nurse Aide (C)	Graphic Design (BFA)	Exercise Science (BS)	Geosciences (BS)	Manufacturing Technology (C, AS, AAS)	Emergency Medical Services (C)
Computer Science (BS)	History (BA)	Kinesiology (BA)	Medical Office Assistant (C, AAS)	Mathematics (BS)	Environmental Science & Technology (BS)
CU-B Mechanical Eng (BSME); Self- study due 2017	Hospitality Management (AAS/BAS)	Nursing (BSN) - CCNE; visit in Fall 2019	Political Science (BA)	Music (BA); NASM	Mass Communication (BA)
Early Childhood Education (C, AA)	Medical Lab Tech (AAS); Self study due 2018; visit in 2019	Nursing (PN) - ACEN; visit in Fall 2018	Process Systems Technology (C, AAS)	Physics (BS)	Psychology (BA)
Mechanical Eng Technology (BS) - ABET visit in fall 2016	Nursing (DNP,MSN) - CCNE; visit in fall 2018	Peace Officer Standards & Training (C)	Radiologic Technology (BAS)	Spanish (BA)	Radiologic Tech (AAS)
Social Work (BSW) - last as CSWE candidate	Nursing (AAS) - ACEN; visit in fall 2017	Sociology (BA)	Technology Integration (C, AAS)	Visual Communication (C, AAS)	Theatre Arts (BA, BFA)
Teacher Education; CCHE & CDE (Spring 2017)		Sport Management (AS/BS)	Water Quality Management (AAS)	Wildland Fire Management (AAS)	
Transportation Services (C, AAS); NATEF Certification					

2. **Academic Department Heads.** S/he will be responsible for coordinating the review of the program within his or her unit. The Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet during the spring semester *prior to* the program review year with the Academic Department Head and program faculty members to discuss the program review process and elements of the self-study. The program faculty members submit the self-study to the Academic Department Head who, in turn, submits a copy of all materials **electronically** to the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Academic Department Head also will coordinate with the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs in setting the external reviewer's itinerary while on campus, including arrangements for the reviewer to visit classes and access coursework offered in any distance format.
3. **Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA).** The AVPAA provides the overall coordination for the program review process with the various participants. The AVPAA, in collaboration with the Academic Department Head and program faculty members, has responsibility for recommending possible external consultants to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA). Once approved by the VPAA, the AVPAA contacts the reviewer to set the dates of the visit and ensures materials are sent to the external reviewer four weeks prior to the visit. In addition to the self-study and related program materials, the AVPAA also provides the following institution-level documents: University catalog, Academic Affairs' At-a-Glance brochure, the prior cycle's program review, and instructions for accessing any coursework delivered in a distance format. Finally, the AVPAA coordinates the site visit and receives the reviewer's report within 30 days following the visit.
4. **The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and the Budget Office.** These staff will generate the data required for the program's statistical summaries as well as conduct a survey of alumni who graduated in the preceding five years. The data produced by these offices constitute the official quantitative information used by units in the program review process, but all program faculty members are responsible for ensuring the validity, reliability and comparability of the data and are expected to cooperate in correcting erroneous information. Disagreements on specific data elements should be reconciled as early as possible in the review process. The statistical summaries are intended to help faculty members make informed observations about their program, but the data summaries do not suggest a reduction of decision-making exclusively to quantitative data. Instead, both quantitative and qualitative information are integral to the review process.
5. **Director of Assessment of Student Learning (DASL).** An integral part of the program review is the reporting of the assessment of student learning. The DASL works directly with faculty members to a) define program-specific learning outcomes and design assessments that contribute to improved student success, b) ensure consistency of program- and institution-level outcomes assessment, and 3) integrate assessment into other evaluation processes such as program review and external accreditations. As part of the program review site visit, the DASL will meet with the external reviewer for questions/concerns regarding program SLO assessment. During the mid- cycle review, the DASL will consult with program faculty to assure there is proper documentation on the assessment/evaluation plan for review by the Assessment Committee. After the review, the DASL also will work with faculty members if changes are needed.
6. **Faculty Assessment Coordinator (FAC).** The Faculty Assessment Coordinator serves as a liaison between the Assessment Committee and the Faculty Senate, the DASL and the VPAA. The coordinator ensures that program assessment documents and the assessment portion of program reviews are evaluated by the Assessment Committee, and that the committee returns feedback to academic departments in a timely manner within the program review cycle as

outlined in Table 2. As part of the program review site visit, the FAC will meet with the external reviewer for questions/concerns regarding program SLO assessment. The Coordinator will facilitate the mid-cycle assessment review with the Assessment Committee and will submit results of the review to the appropriate department heads.

7. **Assessment Committee.** This committee provides a detailed examination and feedback of assessment section of a program review. The results of its review should be submitted by May 15 to the Faculty Senate, the Academic Department Head of the program under review, the Director of Assessment of Student Learning, and the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.
8. **Curriculum Committee(s).** The relevant curriculum committee (i.e. the undergraduate curriculum committee looks at undergraduate graduate program reviews) reviews the curriculum section of program for any issues that affect the curriculum. The results of its review should be submitted by May 15 to the Faculty Senate, the Academic Department Head of the program under review, the Director of Assessment of Student Learning, and the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.
9. **External Reviewer.** The role of the external reviewer is to provide an unbiased review of the program. One of the most important parts of a quality program is having an appropriate and up-to-date curriculum, and thus a main responsibility of the reviewer is to evaluate it. It is understood that delivering the curriculum depends on having the necessary support, and the consultant is expected to comment on that also. To have sufficient time to prepare for the campus visit, the reviewer should receive the packet of materials four weeks prior to the visit. The reviewer makes his/her travel and hotel arrangements, is required to complete a W9 form, and is responsible for payment of taxes related to the visit. The reviewer submits his/her report to the AVPAA within 30 days of the site visit.
10. **Vice President for Academic Affairs.** The VPAA approves the external reviewer, meets with the reviewer while on campus, and makes recommendations regarding the program review to the President. Along with the Academic Department Head, the VPAA makes the presentation about the specific program review to the CMU Board of Trustees.
11. **President.** The President meets with the external reviewer and makes the decision to approve/disapprove the program review.
12. **CMU Board of Trustees.** The Board receives the program's self-study, external reviewer's report, and if relevant, the program faculty members' rejoinder to the external review, as an information item.

C. Calendar of Program Review Activities

February 10 (academic year prior to program review)

Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs meets with the Academic Department Head and program faculty members to discuss the program review process and elements of the self-study. Program cycle is found in Table 1.

April 1 (academic year prior to program review)	Academic Department Head meets with program faculty to plan completion of self-study. Institutional Research (IR) staff will provide data up through the prior academic year.
May 31	Program faculty request additional data from IR staff if desired.
October 20 (academic year of program review)	Program faculty members submit the program self-study to the Academic Department Head. IR staff will provide updated data to include the most recent academic year.
November 1	Academic Department Head submits a copy of all materials electronically to the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.
November 15	Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies Academic Department Head of external reviewer and dates for site visit.
December 1	Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs sends materials to external reviewer at least four weeks prior to the campus visit.
January 15 - March 1	Site visits by external reviewers.
March 15 - 25	Program faculty members and Academic Department Head prepare rejoinder to external reviewer's report (if needed) within ten days of receiving external reviewer's report. Academic Department Head, in turn, submits rejoinder (if applicable) to Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.
March 30	Program review documents prepared for Trustees.
April/May Trustee meeting	Trustees receive program review documents as information items.
May 15	Reports on program review from Curriculum Committee and Assessment Committee submitted to the Faculty Senate, the Academic Department Head of the program under review, and the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.
December 1 (academic year following program review)	Program faculty submit student learning outcomes assessment plan to the Academic Department Head, who after review and approval, sends them to Director of Assessment of Student Learning and to Faculty Assessment Coordinator (see Table 2).

Table 2. Schedule for Data Collection and Reporting of Assessment Results for Student Learning Outcomes

Year of Program Review	SLO Reporting for Programs in Cycle 5	SLO Reporting for Programs in Cycle 6	SLO Reporting for Programs in Cycle 1	SLO Reporting for Programs in Cycle 2	SLO Reporting for Programs in Cycle 3	SLO Reporting for Programs in Cycle 4
2016-17	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data	Collect Data	Progress Report	Collect Data	Collect Data
2017-18	Collect Data	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data	Collect Data	Progress Report	Collect Data
2018-19	Collect Data	Collect Data	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data	Collect Data	Progress Report
2019-20	Progress Report	Collect Data	Collect Data	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data	Collect Data
2020-21	Collect Data	Progress Report	Collect Data	Collect Data	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data
2021-22	Collect Data	Collect Data	Progress Report	Collect Data	Collect Data	Program Review & Assessment Plan
2022-23	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data	Collect Data	Progress Report	Collect Data	Collect Data
2023-24	Collect Data	Program Review & Assessment Plan	Collect Data	Collect Data	Progress Report	Collect Data

Program Review = self-study due including reporting of assessment data collected in previous years.

Assessment Plan = includes refining of program SLOs and assessments, if needed, and planning for collection of data for next six years.

Collect data = annual collection of assessment data and reporting of results/actions taken based on findings.

Progress (mid-cycle) Report due = narrative to include results of data collected in first three years, program SLOs and assessments refined as appropriate.

Note 1: As new programs are added, a progress report is due three years after initial implementation of a program.

Note 2: See Table 1 for program level associated with scheduled review year.

Cycle 5 Programs	Cycle 6 Programs	Cycle 1 Programs	Cycle 2 Programs	Cycle 3 Programs	Cycle 4 Programs
Accounting	Anim, Film, & Mot Des	Chemistry	Adm Office Tech	Baking & Pastry	Business Admin(BBA)
Agri Sci; Sustainable Agri	Art	Constr Technology	Biological Sci	Comp Info Systems	Culinary Arts
Athletic Training	Business (MBA)	Criminal Justice	Electric Lineworker	Construction Mgt	Dance
Certified Nurse Asst	English	Exercise Science	Geosciences	Manufacturing Tech	Emergency Med Serv
Computer Science	Graphic Design	Kinesiology	Med Office Asst	Mathematics	Env Sci & Tech
Early Childhood Ed	History	Nursing (BSN)	Political Science	Music	Mass Communication
Mech Engineering Tech	Hospitality Mgt	Nursing (PN)	Proc Sys Technology	Physics	Psychology
Social Work	Medical Lab Techn	Peace Officer St & Tr	Radiologic Tech (BAS)	Spanish	Radiologic Tech (AAS)
Teacher Education	Nursing (graduate)	Sociology	Tech Integration	Visual Commun	Theatre Arts
Transp Services	Nursing (AAS)	Sport Management	Water Quality Mgt	Wildland Fire Mgt	

Note 3: Mech Eng w/ CU-Boulder

C. Calendar of Program Review Activities (cont.)

December 1 (3rd academic year following program review)

Program faculty members submit student learning outcomes assessment mid-cycle report to the Academic Department Head, who approves after review, sends them to Director of Assessment of Student Learning and the Faculty Assessment Coordinator (see Table 2).

Note: Collection and faculty review of assessment data occurs annually for all SLOs.

- D. Program Review Self-study Elements.** Before the self-study begins, program faculty members should review the prior cycle's review document(s) for context.

Note: The self-study document must be submitted as a single document in Microsoft Word format to the Office of Academic Affairs by the specified deadline. Documents submitted in a .pdf format will not be accepted.

1. Introduction and Program Overview (2 - 3 pages):

- a. Program description by level, identifying concentrations and minors as applicable;
- b. Brief history of the program;
- c. Recommendations from the previous external review and progress made toward addressing them (copy found on CMU assessment website);
- d. Mission statement and goals for the program, including the program's centrality to CMU's role and mission and strategic plan, and as applicable, how it adds value to the region;
- e. How the program's curriculum supports other majors/minors and general education requirements, as applicable
- f. Locational/comparative advantage;
- g. Any unique characteristics of the program; and
- h. Other information/data (program's option).

2. Curriculum (2 -4 pages):

- a. Describe the program's curriculum in terms of its breadth, depth, and level of the discipline.
- b. Program currency. What curricular changes have been made since the last program review?
- c. Description of program delivery locations and formats and how it has shifted to meet the changing needs of its students.

3. Analysis of Student Demand and Success (4 - 6 pages): A narrative describing trends related to the following data that are generated by the institutional research and budget offices' staff. The narrative also should identify any program-specific admissions criteria and comment on program's growth potential, particularly in light of any planned curricular changes. While the five-year data should be included as appendices to the self-study, summary tables may be incorporated into the narrative.

- a. Number of majors (by concentration(s)) and minors;
- b. Registrations and student credit hours by student level;
- c. Registrations and student credit hours (fall and spring terms) subtotaled by course level;
- d. Number of graduates (by concentration);
- e. Student successes/recognitions, especially in external student competitions; and
- f. Other information/data (program's option).

4. Program Resources (4 - 6 pages): A narrative describing trends related to following data generated by Institutional Research, Library, and Budget offices. While the five-year data should be included as appendices to the report, summary tables may be incorporated into the narrative.

- a. Faculty
 - 1) Ratio of full-time equivalent students (FTES) to full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF);
 - 2) Course credit hours and student credit hours by faculty type (i.e., tenured/tenure-track, instructor, administrators/staff/coaches, lecturers);
 - 3) Faculty successes/quality/recognitions - details related to teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and other achievements;
 - 4) Faculty vitas should be included in an appendix.
 - 5) Other data (program's option).

- b. Financial Information (finance and budget): As part of this narrative, describe any significant increases or decreases in the unit cost of the program during the review period, noting factors that may be affecting costs and the possibility of correcting any deviation within existing resources.
 - 1) Total budget revenues and program expenditures
 - 2) Ratio of total expenditures/student credit hours
 - 3) External funding (if applicable): Any external funding the program or its faculty have submitted and received since the last review. What potential opportunities exist for obtaining external funds during the next six years?
- c. Library assessment;
- d. Physical facilities;
- e. Instructional technology and equipment;
- f. Efficiencies in the way the program is operated;
- g. Other information/data (program's option).

5. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments (6 - 8 pages): While five-year data tables should be included as appendices to the report, summary tables may be incorporated into the narrative. Note for programs with professional accreditation/state approval: If student learning outcomes and their assessment are part of the self-study, learning outcomes information may be submitted in the format required by the review agency; if not, these programs should follow the items listed below. Additionally, these programs are required to submit mid-cycle reports as described in section F, with the format to be determined by the Director of the Assessment of Student Learning in collaboration with the Academic Department Head. See Table 2 for SLO reporting schedule of reporting and follow-up.

Elements to be addressed in this section include:

- a. List student learning outcomes (SLOs) for the program and how they relate to the program's mission statement and courses. A **current** curriculum map should be included in the appendix. The program should also describe how it contributes to the achievement of the institution-wide student learning outcomes as applicable.
- b. Identify the direct and indirect measurements that assess the program's student learning outcomes and include the most recent Program Assessment Plan Three-year summary report (see attached template) -in an appendix. What does the assessment information indicate about how effective the program is in preparing students for the future? Identify any other documentation of program quality, including external validation. While assessment results in specific coursework can be reported, the report should focus on outcomes at the program level. Assessment results should be listed in the Three- Year Assessment Summary Report and include a narrative that analyzes the results and describes the actions taken (closing the loop).

Information on student satisfaction also can be reported as well as current student and alumni success (i.e., graduate employment, awards, pass rates on licensure exams, graduate school acceptance and admissions test scores (GRE, MCAT, LSAT, etc.), advanced degrees obtained, results of alumni and employer surveys, etc.);

- c. Describe program improvements resulting from assessment of SLOs since the last program review;
- d. Indicate if student learning outcomes being refined, or if data collection being modified (if applicable); and
- e. Other information/data related to learning outcomes assessment (program's option).

6. Future Program Plans (2 pages):

- a. Vision for program;

- b. Strengths and challenges facing program;
- c. Trends in the discipline that could affect future planning for program (if applicable);
- d. How program review process is being used to improve the program's teaching and learning;
- e. Recommended program's challenges and potential resources needed to address them.

E. The External Review

1. Selection of the External Reviewer

A program's external reviewer will be chosen by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Program faculty members, the relevant Academic Department Head, and Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs are encouraged to make recommendations for potential reviewers. Among the factors considered in selecting a reviewer are that s/he has:

- had no prior connection to the CMU/WCCC program or any of its faculty members;
- had experience at an institution similar to Colorado Mesa in its role and mission, program mix, and size;
- been a program review consultant for other institutions' programs;
- been involved in the program's professional organization(s) or a professional organization aligned with the discipline;
- had experience in delivering coursework via distance delivery, preferably in an online format;
- worked at multiple institutions and thus has had exposure to different, but current, curricular approaches to a program; and/or
- been an active teacher-scholar in the discipline.

The State of Colorado views external program reviewers as consultants who receive a flat-rate payment which includes all travel-related expenses. The cost of the reviewer is paid by the Office of Academic Affairs. The reviewer makes his/her travel and hotel arrangements, is required to complete a W9 form, and is responsible for payment of taxes related to the visit.

2. External Reviewer's Site Visit

The reviewer spends 1 - 2 days on campus. The Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs coordinates the reviewer's itinerary with the Academic Department Head, program faculty, staff, and administrators. As part of the visit, the external reviewer generally will meet with the following:

- President;
- Vice President for Academic Affairs;
- Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs;
- Academic Department Head;
- Program faculty members;
- Students, including those majoring in the program;
- Director of Tomlinson Library;
- Director of Assessment of Student Learning;
- Faculty Assessment Coordinator;
- Executive Director of Information Technology and Telecommunications;
- Graduates of the program; and
- Employers of graduates or an external advisory council, if applicable.

During the time on campus, the reviewer should visit at least two courses, one at the upper-division level and the other at the lower division. The reviewer may request that the instructor leave the room while the reviewer visits with the students. For programs with courses offered via a distance format, the Academic Department head should recommend two courses and arrange for the reviewer to have access to them for observation purposes prior to arriving on campus. The reviewer might tour the library and/or computer labs as relevant while at CMU. Exit interviews

will be scheduled between the reviewer and 1) the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and 2) the AVPAA and 1 - 2 representatives from the program under review.

The AVPAA and the Academic Department Head may host the reviewer for dinner, and program faculty members may host the reviewer for breakfast or lunch. The Academic Department Head must have official function forms approved by the VPAA prior to the event and follow the State's official function regulations. Otherwise the cost of meals for faculty members, students, or alumni eating lunch or dinner with the reviewer must be paid from department funds or individuals may be expected to pay their own expenses.

3. External Reviewer's Report

a. Narrative

Generally speaking, the external reviewer's final report should assess the overall quality of the program based on the self-study report as well as observations and conclusions from meetings with the academic department head, program faculty members, students, alumni, administration, and other stakeholders as appropriate. The reviewer should identify "best practices" employed by the program as well evidence of student learning and quality found in students' work, such as in portfolios or other projects. Weaknesses/challenges identified in the program and strategies the program faculty members might take to address these elements also should be part of the narrative.

The reviewer's report should be limited to the topics outlined in Section D above and not discuss topics unrelated to program qualities. The final report, including the executive summary table, should be received by the AVPAA no later than 30 days following the campus visit who distributes it to the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Academic Department Head who, in turn, shares with program faculty members. The reviewer's recommendations for program improvement should be prioritized either from most important to least, or grouped according to short-term vs. longer-term improvements. Program faculty members and the Academic Department Head may submit a rejoinder to the reviewer's report, if desired, within 10 days of receiving the reviewer's report.

b. Executive Summary

1) Tabular Form

Table 3 presents an executive summary of elements to be completed by the reviewer in addition to the report narrative.

2) Recommendations

- a) List the 3 - 5 recommendations for program improvement of highest priority. What is the most important improvement this program needs to make during this review cycle, within the context of limited resource availability?
- b) What are the most exemplary element(s) about this program?

F. Follow-up Processes

1. Assessment Plan

Program faculty will submit a refined plan for the assessment of student learning outcomes by December 1 of the academic year following the program review. It should be submitted **electronically** to the Director of the Assessment of Student Learning and the Assessment Committee.

2. Progress (Mid-cycle) Assessment Report

Three years after completion of the program review, faculty members will submit a progress report on its assessment activities **electronically** to the Director of the Assessment of Student Learning and the Assessment Committee by December 1. This report will focus on progress that has been made in evaluating student learning by identifying measurements used, describing findings based on the assessments, and listing improvements to the program based on the assessment results.

Table 3. Executive Summary Template for External Reviewer’s Observations

Program Review Element	Check the appropriate selection				Provide explanation if not agree with element and/or why unable to evaluate
	Agree	Not Agree	Unable to Evaluate	Not Applicabl	
The program’s self-study is a realistic and accurate appraisal of the program.					
The program’s mission and its contributions are consistent with the institution's role and mission and its strategic goals.					
The program’s goals are being met.					
The curriculum is appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline.					
The curriculum is current, follows best practices, and/or adheres to the professional standards of the discipline.					
Student demand/enrollment is at an expected level in the context of the institution and program’s role and mission.					
The program's teaching-learning environment fosters success of the program's students.					
Program faculty members are appropriately credentialed.					
Program faculty members actively contribute to scholarship, service and advising.					
Campus facilities meet the program’s needs.					
Equipment meets the program’s needs.					
Instructional technology meets the program’s needs.					
Current library resources meet the program’s needs.					
Student learning outcomes are appropriate to the discipline, clearly stated, measurable, and assessed.					
Program faculty members are involved in on-going assessment efforts.					
Program faculty members analyze student learning outcome data and program effectiveness to foster continuous improvement.					
The program’s articulation of its strengths and challenges is accurate/ appropriate and integral to its future planning.					

September 7, 2012

COLORADO MESA UNIVERSITY

Three-Year Summary Report

_____ Program

The Colorado Mesa University assessment progress report will consist of areas regarding program student learning outcomes, results, and actions taken over a 3-year period. Please attach the last three years of annual assessment reports, and any department/program minutes that recorded discussion of learning outcomes. Summarize each student learning outcome that has been assessed over the past three years. Attach rubrics used in assessment, if possible.

Assessment Summary

Program Outcome 1	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection

Results Summary

Year	Results (Include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)

Actions Taken (Briefly describe the analysis of the results and actions taken for future assessment. Indicate any budget implications based on the analysis. Limit 150 words.)

Program Outcome 2	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection

Results Summary

Year	Results (Include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)

Actions Taken

Program Outcome 3	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection

Results Summary

Year	Results (Include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)

Actions Taken:

Program Outcome 4	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection

Results Summary

Year	Results (Include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)

Actions Taken:

Program Outcome 5	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection

Results Summary

Year	Results (Include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)

Actions Taken:

Program Outcome 6	Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)	Assessment Method(s)	Semester of Data Collection

Results Summary

Year	Results (Include numbers of students)	Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)

Actions Taken: