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Types of Program Reviews
There are four categories of Academic Affairs Units that are required to do program reviews:

1. Academic departments will use the academic program review model.
2. Inter-disciplinary programs, e.g., Women’s Studies; Honors; Latino Studies; African-American Studies, etc., will use the academic program model.
3. Units that directly support the academic and instructional programs of the University, e.g., Academic Advisement, Act 101/Pace, Admissions, Library, Migrant Education, Office of the Registrar, Office of Graduate Studies and Upward Bound will use the academic- and student-support units Model for Program Review.
4. Other administrative units, such as Police, Alumni Programs, Facilities Management and Web & Multimedia Services will use the academic- and student-support units’ model, but not be submitted to the System Office and, consequently, not make use of the on-line summary.

Due to the diverse nature of programs, customized data elements could not be in the data packets (see Attachment 3). The Institutional Research Office will provide University-wide data for academic program reviews, but each unit will have to provide customized data.

Introduction
The State System of Higher Education (SSHE) adopted a policy stating that all university programs shall be evaluated at least once every five years (Attachment 1). When deemed appropriate, the university president or his/her designee may require a shorter review interval. (It is the intent for such interim reviews to address the period of time since the previous program review was completed.)

In order to simplify the program review process as well as to make it more meaningful to individual schools/departments/units, there have been a number of key changes that have been made since the distribution of former Provost Taggie’s memo of September 24, 1993:

- A standard program data packet (Attachment 3) has been compiled by the staff of the Office of Institutional Research – for academic program reviews only.
- No more than three (3) areas of focus for the program review will be required.
- A final report will not exceed ten (10) pages of narrative.
- With the approval of the Vice President, accreditation reviews can be integrated with the program review process, even replacing the program review, but it may be necessary to expand the accreditation review to insure meeting all program review requirements.
- Academic and academic- and student-support unit program reviews must complete the State System Summary Form (use the MSWord version until the on-line form is available at the PASSHE web site – see Attachment 8).
- Administrative units may use an external evaluator from within the State System, all others must secure at least one evaluator from outside the State System.
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Purposes of the Program Review

The SSHE Board of Governors Program Review Policy statement lists three purposes for the need for system universities to undertake a program review process:

- To assure deliberate and continuous attention to enhancement of the quality and to assure mission centrality of academic- and student-support programs with State System Universities.
- To analyze and employ quantitative and qualitative data, including student-learning outcomes, on individual programs that will contribute to both university and State System planning.
- To provide the chancellor and Board of Governors, as well as the council of trustees of each university, with assurance that University programs are being assessed in a systematic fashion and that plans for making continuous improvements are developed and implemented.

In addition to the above broad purposes, each academic department or unit should use the process to improve its current programs and develop a vision statement that outlines what it would take to make these programs even stronger (and possibly different or unique for Millersville’s service region), and that describes what human and physical resources will be required to accomplish this vision. An action plan is an essential component of the program review process.

Timeline

It normally will take eighteen (18) months to complete the program review process (Attachments 4 and 5).

Audience

A unit’s self-study and action plan are also important components for reports submitted to the Middle States Association and other professional accreditation groups (Attachment 6). In addition to the final approval of the program reviews by the Dean/Director, Vice President, and President, the Board of Governors requires a three-page summary of each program review to be completed (Attachments 7 and 8). All non-administrative program reviews must complete the State System Summary Form (use the MSWord version until the on-line form is available at the PASSHE web site – see Attachment 8).

Budget

A limit of $1,500 per review has been established for hiring external reviewers, printing and postage costs, and some miscellaneous expenses. If expenses exceed $1,500, academic departments/units are expected to cover these costs from their operating budgets.
Contents of Program Review Packet

The attached materials include:

Attachment 1: Board of Governor’s Program Review Policy 1986-04-A
Attachment 2: Administrative Procedure for policy 1986-04-A
Attachment 3: Data Analysis for Program Review of Academic Programs
Attachment 4: Program Review Process Timeline
Attachment 5: Program Review Process Flowchart
Attachment 6: Standard Format for Program Review Report
Attachment 7: Chancellor’s Program Review Summary Form Instructions
Attachment 8: Chancellor’s Program Review Summary Form –Please note that
Millersville University’s MSWord version of this Summary Form is available for internal development at
http://muweb.millersville.edu/~ir/pgm_rev.html until the on-line version is available at the PASSHE web site.

This format is intended to provide the basis for a complete review of academic departments and interdisciplinary programs.
POLICY

Amended Policy:  Approved by the Board of Governors
See Also: October 9, 2003

POL- 1986-04-A: PROGRAM REVIEW

NOTE: The provisions of Board of Governors’ Policy 1991-06 shall take precedence over those areas where inconsistencies may exist.

Background

Periodic program review is a best practice in American higher education that involves stakeholders in the continuous improvement of existing academic and academic- and student support programs. Such review includes an analysis of past performance that is used to inform present and future directions and decision-making. The review process must be integrated with strategic-planning and budgeting processes, with regional and specialized accreditation processes, and with student-learning outcomes assessment. Criteria that direct the implementation of this policy can be found in the document, Administrative Procedure for Board of Governors Policy 1986-04-A, Program Review.

A. Purposes of Program Review

1. To assure deliberate and continuous attention to enhancement of the quality and to assure mission centrality of academic and academic- and student-support programs within State System Universities.

2. To analyze and employ quantitative and qualitative data, including student-learning outcomes, on individual programs which will contribute to both University and State System planning.

3. To provide the chancellor and Board of Governors, as well as the council of trustees of each University, with assurance that University programs are being assessed in a systematic fashion and that plans for making continuous improvements are developed and implemented.

B. Guidelines for Program Review

1. Cycle. All University programs not subject to specialized accreditation shall be evaluated at least once every five years; when deemed necessary, the University president may require a shorter review interval for given programs. At least once every 10 years, each program not subject to specialized accreditation shall be reviewed by an appropriate external evaluator.
2. **Types of Reviews.** The full review is for programs not subject to specialized accreditation and requires external consultation. The president or designee may designate a program subject to specialized accreditation for a full program review.

The modified review is for programs subject to specialized accreditation. The modified review must include the accreditor’s recommendations/suggestions and rejoinder, when appropriate.

3. **Process.** Each University shall have guidelines and procedures for program review including timelines which provide for ample lead time for programs to be reviewed in any given year and a schedule for responding to review findings and recommendations.

4. **Criteria for Full Review of Academic and Academic- and Student-Support Programs.** The Office of the Chancellor shall, in consultation with State System Universities, establish and review criteria for the academic and academic- and student-support program reviews.

**C. Reporting**

1. The president or designee shall keep the council of trustees apprised of program reviews and their outcomes.

2. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs will develop an appropriate procedure and timeline for periodic reporting to the Board of Governors.

*Adopted: July 15, 1986*

*Amended: October 17, 1991 and October 9, 2003*
Administrative Procedure
for
BOARD OF GOVERNORS’ POLICY 1986-04-A
Program Review

Background

Periodic program review is a best practice in American higher education that involves stakeholders in the continuous improvement of existing academic and academic- and student-support programs. Such review includes an analysis of past performance that is used to inform present and future directions and decision-making. The review process must be integrated with strategic-planning and budgeting processes, with regional and specialized accreditation processes, and with student-learning outcomes assessment.

A. Guidelines for Program Review

1. **Cycle.** All University programs not subject to specialized accreditation shall be evaluated at least once every five years; when deemed necessary, the University president may require a shorter review interval for any programs. Reviews of programs that are subject to specialized accreditation shall be due within three months of receipt of the final letter and report from the accreditor. At least once every 10 years, each program not subject to specialized accreditation shall be reviewed by an appropriate external evaluator.

2. **Types of Reviews.** The full review is for programs not subject to specialized accreditation and requires external consultation. The President or designee may designate a program subject to specialized accreditation for a full program review. The modified review is for programs subject to specialized accreditation. The modified review must include the accreditor’s recommendations/suggestions and rejoinder, when appropriate.

3. **Criteria for Full Review of Academic Programs.** A self-study shall be conducted for all academic programs scheduled for review. Reviews of academic programs shall include analyses of data pertaining to the following criteria:

   a. *Goals set during last review and progress in meeting those goals*

   b. *Mission centrality*

   c. *Environmental scan (covering topics such as changing student characteristics, impact of technology on services, evolving student expectations, and federal and state statutes as well as policies and legal decisions affecting programs, continuing need for the program and currency of curriculum)*
d. Demand
   *Enrollment trends
   Student credit-hour generation
   Course enrollments

e. Program Organization

   Structure – Include collaborations if appropriate.
   *Faculty credentials and diversity
   *Student diversity
   *Resources – Include items such as the following:
     Staffing levels, facilities, and budget, or actual costs
   *Library and other learning resources
   *Academic policies, standards, and grading practices

f. Program and Student Learning Outcomes

   *Faculty achievements (e.g., grants, presentations, publications awards)
   *Student achievements (e.g., awards, presentations, publications, research)
   *Program outcomes – Include, as appropriate, items such as the following:
     Test scores,
     Retention data,
     4- and 6-year graduation rates,
     Graduate- and professional school-acceptance,
     Employment rates,
     Employer assessments, and
     Economic or community development.
   *Student Learning Outcomes – describe the knowledge and skill outcomes
     and how they are assessed.

g. Unique/special program features

h. *Post-review implementation plan – Faculty/staff in each program must
   develop an implementation plan for continuous enhancement by building
   upon strengths and addressing challenges. The implementation plan,
   which must also include goals and action items to be accomplished by the
   next review period, will become final only after it has been approved by
   the president or designee.

Other categories of information may be added at the University’s discretion. The
Office of the Chancellor, in consultation with State System universities, shall
establish and review criteria for the academic program reviews.

*Required items
4. **Criteria for Full Review of Academic- and Student-Support Programs.** A self-study shall be conducted for all academic- and student-support programs or services scheduled for review. At minimum, the following academic- and student-support programs shall be reviewed: library, student life, enrollment services (e.g., admissions, bursar, registrar), public safety, judicial affairs, financial aid, counseling, athletics, residence life, career services, academic support services, and disability services. Reviews of academic- and student-support programs shall include analyses of data pertaining to the following criteria.

a. *Goals set during last review and progress in meeting those goals*

b. *Mission centrality*

c. *Environmental scan (covering topics such as changing student characteristics, impact of technology on services, evolving student expectations, and federal and state statutes as well as policies and legal decisions affecting services)*

d. *Demand*

   *Number of students served*
   *Characteristics of clientele served, when appropriate*
   Relationship to mandates and/or system requirements, when appropriate

e. *Program Organization*

   Structure – Emphasis on how structure facilitates attainment of goals and objectives
   *Cooperation/interaction/collaboration with other University departments, with other State System Universities, and with appropriate external groups*
   **Faculty/staff credentials and diversity**
   **Student-employee diversity**
   *Resources – Analysis of the following:*
   Use of technology, when appropriate
   Appropriateness of staffing to university and program goals
   Fiscal, human physical and other resources as appropriate

   **Facilities and equipment**

f. *Currency of departmental policies (development/revisions, reasons, impact, etc.)*

g. Accreditation/approval, when appropriate

h. Program and Student Learning Outcomes
Faculty/staff achievements
*Creative/innovative strategies
*Student engagement/leadership/involvement in program development, policy development, employment searches, etc.
*Student-learning outcomes
*Student satisfaction (e.g., Noel-Levitz, ACT, CIRP, etc.)
*Effectiveness in serving minorities and other underrepresented groups
*Effectiveness in serving special-needs students, when appropriate

i. Unique/special program features

j. *Post-review implementation plan – Faculty/staff in each program must develop an implementation plan for continuous enhancement by building upon strengths and addressing challenges. The implementation plan, which must also include goals and action items to be accomplished by the next review period, will become final only after it has been approved by the president or designee.

Other categories of information may be added at the University’s discretion. The Office of the Chancellor, in consultation with State System universities, shall establish and review criteria for the academic- and student-support programs reviews.

*Required items

B. Evaluation

1. Internal Evaluators: Committees appointed or designated to review self-study documents and make recommendations about the program in question should include at least two people not directly responsible for the program; these may include faculty or administrators from other units, students, and/or alumni.

2. External Evaluators: External review of existing academic, and academic- and student-support programs is a standard practice in higher education. The purpose of external review is to garner additional perspectives on program strengths and weaknesses from individuals in the field or a closely related field who are affiliated with other institutions. Except under special circumstances, external evaluations are to be from outside the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education.

C. Reporting

1. The president or designee shall keep the council of trustees apprised of program reviews and their outcomes.

2. By August 15, each University president or designee shall submit to the State System Office of Academic and Student Affairs a Program Review Summary.
Form for each program review completed during the year. For an accreditation review, however, a report shall be submitted by 30 days after the receipt of an external accreditation report. Such summaries should include the major findings and recommendations emanating from the review and note the planned timetable for implementing the recommendations. In specific instances, follow-up reports or information may be requested.

3. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs will develop an appropriate procedure and timeline for periodic reporting to the Board of Governors.

Approved: October 9, 2003
DATA ANALYSIS FOR PROGRAM REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

I. Admissions Data by Year for Five Years

A. New Undergraduate Students
   Department
   University

B. New Student Summary
   Department
   Degree
   University

C. Analysis of SAT and high school rank
   Department
   University

D. Analysis for Graduate GRE and MAT
   Department
   University
   Degree

II. Student Enrollment Demographics by Year for Five Years

A. Undergraduate Majors by Options where available in the MU system. (Minors will be added in the future.)

B. Graduate Students by Degree Programs

C. Status and Residence by Department and University for Graduate and Undergraduate Students
   Part-time
   Full-time
   In-state
   Out-of-state
   Degree status

D. Demographics by Department and University for Graduate and Undergraduate Students
   Race
   Gender

E. Class Distribution by Department and University for Graduate and Undergraduate Students.

F. Degrees Conferred by Department and University for Graduate and Undergraduate Students
III. Resources by Department and University
   A. Summary of Faculty Complement
   B. Summary of Staff Complement
   C. Summary of Graduate Assistants
   D. Fiscal Data Report for Each Department

IV. Productivity Measures for Department and University
   A. Student
   B. Department Summary
   C. University Summary
   D. Degrees Conferred
   E. Cost Per Credit Hour for University
   F. Retention Summary
   G. Benchmarking Data (To be added when available)

V. Grade Distribution
   A. Lower Division Courses
   B. Upper Division Courses
   C. Graduate Division Courses

VI. Data Table for Summary Form
 TABLES

Admissions Data

New Undergraduate Students Summary by Category of Admission for Department and University
   (Regular, ACT 101, Special Admits, Freshmen, Transfers, Readmits, Non-degree) by (Total Full-time/Part-time)

New Undergraduate Student Summary by Category of Admission
   (Degree, Non-Degree, Teacher Certification) by (Total Full-time/Part-time)

New Graduate Student Admission for Summer, Fall and Spring by Degree

Analysis of SAT and high school rank for Department and University
   (SAT Verbal, SAT Math, SAT Combined, High School Rank) by (Year of Admission)

Analysis of Graduate GRE and MAT Scores for Department, University and by Degree

Student Enrollment Demographics

Undergraduate Majors by Option, by Year, and by Curriculum

Graduate Students by Degree Programs

Status and Residence for Department and University at Graduate and Undergraduate Levels
   (Part-time, Full-time, In-State, Out-of-State by Year) by (Graduate, Undergraduate)

Demographics for Department and University at Graduate and Undergraduate Levels
   (Race, Gender) by (Graduate, Undergraduate)

Resources for Department, School, and University

Analysis of Faculty Complement
   (Rank and Step, Tenure, Type of Appointment, Appointment Date - University and Department, Percentage of Employment, Leave, Gender, Race)

Analysis of Staff Complement
   (Title, Type, Percent, Date of University Appointment, Gender, Race)

Analysis of Graduate Assistants
   (Department, School, Program, University)

Fiscal Data Report for Department
   (Fiscal Year, Personnel Dollars, Operations Dollars, Total)
Productivity Measures for Department and University

Common Cost Analysis for System

Student FTE for Lower Division, Upper Division and Graduate Division

Departmental Summary
(FTE Students, Instructional Dollars, FTE Faculty, Complement, Student/Faculty Ratio)

University Summary
(FTE Students, Instructional Dollars, FTE Faculty, Complement, Student/Faculty Ratio)

Degrees Conferred
(Graduate and Undergraduate)

Cost per Credit Hour for Department
(Lower Division, Upper Division, Graduate Division, Total)

Retention Rates for Department and University

Grade Distribution

Lower Division
(Student Grade Count, Department Grade Average, Student Session GPA, Student Cumulative GPA)

Upper Division
(Student Grade Count, Department Grade Average, Student Session GPA, Student Cumulative GPA)

Graduate Division
(Student Grade Count, Department Grade Average, Student Session Average, Student Cumulative Average)

Data Table for Summary Form
(Complete Program Data Table, Table II, for Chancellor’s Summary Report)
PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS TIMELINE

April 1  **Initiation of Program Review Process**
- Institutional Research notifies Vice President/Dean/Director & Office of Institutional Planning and Assessment of departments or other unit(s) scheduled for review
- Vice President/Dean/Director notifies Department Chairperson(s) or Unit Head(s)
- OIR develops data packets and conducts analysis

September 1  **Establishment of Program Review Team and Program Review Focus**
- Department Chairperson or Unit Head assembles Program Review Team
- Institutional Researcher reviews data packet with review team and Dean/Director. Team also reviews previous five-year program review, outcomes assessment information, accreditation review, the Board of Governors Criteria for Program Review, and the MU Program Review Report format.
- Department Chairperson will prepare analysis of the information as agreed upon by the group
- Unit Team and Dean/Director meet to identify the areas of focus for the program review (no more than three areas). Areas of focus are approved by the Vice President.

November 1  **Conducting Program Review**
- Department or Unit begins the program review
- Dean/Director, Department Chair or Unit Head and Unit Team meet to assess progress and identify external reviewers
- External reviewers are invited by the Dean/Director and arrangements for review are completed
- Draft of report based upon Standard Format for Program Review and data packet and analysis are submitted to external reviewers by Dean/Director
- External reviewer(s) visits campus and completes report of review
April 1  Preparation of Program Review Report

- Vice President, Dean/Director, Department Chairperson or Unit Head and Unit Team meet to discuss program strengths, weaknesses, recommendations and action plan

June 1  Draft Report Submission by Unit

- Unit submits a draft of the final report based upon the standard format for program review reports to the appropriate dean/director by June 1. This should include a draft of the full report and the three-page Program Review Summary Form. Reports from external consultants should be included.

July 1  Final Report Submission by Unit

- Dean/director and department chair or unit head meet to review the draft of the full report. Unit submits final full report to Dean/Director by July 1.

- Dean/Director and Vice President finalize the Millersville University template version of the Office of the Chancellor’s web-based Program Review Summary Form.

July 15  Final Report Submission by Dean/Director

- Dean/Director submits full Program Review Report and external consultant report(s) by July 15 to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment with a copy sent to the Ganser Library Archives. The Dean/Director submits the Millersville template of the program review summary with the appropriate signatures to the Vice President by July 15 and copying the Assistant Provost for Institutional Planning and Assessment and Ganser Library Archives.

August 15  Report Filing

- Dean/Unit submits the web-based program review summary form to the Office of the Chancellor.
- Vice President submits copies of the Summary Report form to the Millersville University Council of Trustees at COT September Meeting.
Program Review Process Flowchart (Attachment 5)

Program Selected for Review

Office of Institutional Research develops data packets & conducts analysis

Dean/Director notifies Dept. Chairperson or Unit Head

Dept. Chairperson or Unit Head assembles Program Review Team

Institutional Researcher reviews data packet with Unit Team and Dean/Director, all but for Institutional Researcher review previous 5-year program review, accreditation review & BOG criteria for program review

Unit Team, Dean/Director, Vice President or designee meet to identify the areas of focus for the program review

Dept. or Unit begins the program review

Meet to assess progress & to identify external reviewers

External reviewers are invited by Dean/Director

Draft of report prepared for external reviewers completed by Unit team

Draft of Report reviewed/approved/submitted to external reviewers by Dean/Director

External Reviewers visit campus & complete report

Vice President, Dean/Director, Dept. Chairperson or Unit Head/Unit Team meet to agree upon program weaknesses, strengths, recommendations & action plan for final report

Unit prepares final report

Dean/Director & Dept. Chair or Unit Head prepare draft of Program Review Summary Report for System

Dean/Director & Vice President prepare Program Review Summary Report, Dean/Director submits web-based version

Vice President submits copies of the Summary Report form to the
STANDARD FORMAT FOR PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

I. Introduction (Unit and University Missions: Unit organization and management; environmental trends affecting unit’s services; demand for services; and resource needs)

II. Composition of Review Team

III. Progress since Last Review

IV. Summary of Relevant Statistics

V. Outcome Assessment Information

VI. Criteria for Review of Areas of Focus Selected

VII. Department Review of Selected Criteria

VIII. Reports of External Reviewers

IX. Program Weaknesses and Strengths

X. Recommendations

XI. Action Plan Including Resource Requests
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education

Academic Program Review Summary Form Instructions

NOTE: ONCE THE FORM HAS BEEN SAVED, YOU CANNOT GO BACK AND CHANGE ANY OF THE ENTRIES. PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU COMPLETE ALL OF YOUR EDITS AND REVISIONS BEFORE THE REPORT IS SAVED AND SUBMITTED.

General Instructions:

Composition of Review Team

1. There should be adequate space to list all of the review team members. If this is a year when you did not use external review team members, enter “NA” in the first field.

2. Some of the review committees may have co-chairs. Where this is the case, list the other co-chair in the Campus Review Team Members section and note accordingly.

Program Data

1. Enter data for the academic years that followed the last review. If this is the first time the unit is being reviewed, enter data for as many past years as appropriate.

2. Student Enrollment, Annualized FTEs – This number includes students enrolled in program courses. Calculation for undergraduates: number of credits divided by 30; graduates: number of credits divided by 24.

3. Program Budget/Cost – Use whatever method is readily available. Either reflect the portion of the department’s budget (personnel, operating and equipment), or use the Common Cost Accounting costs associated with the program.

4. Program Cost/FTEs – calculated by dividing the program budget/cost by student enrollment, annualized FTEs.

5. Faculty FTEs – calculate this number based on instructional faculty workload assignment. Contact a staff member in your campus Finance and Administration or Institutional Research offices for this formula, if necessary.

6. Majors Enrolled, Fall Headcount – use the figure submitted after the fall freeze deadline.

7. Program Graduates – this headcount figure should include summer, fall, and spring program graduates.

Staffing

1. List position titles, and number of people who hold those positions, if applicable.

Progress Since Last Review

1. Enter the action items that were identified during the last review and the steps that were taken to accomplish the action item. The box in which you enter the information is set up to handle a narrative. If this is the first time the unit or program is being reviewed, type “NA” in the first Action Item box.
Outcomes Assessment

1. In this section, please list the intended learning outcomes, when appropriate, and how they are measured.

Program Strengths

1. List the program strengths as identified in the self-study and review report.

Areas in Need of Improvement

1. List the challenges and recommendations for improvement as identified in the self-study and the review report.

Action Plan

1. List the recommendations and challenges that will be addressed prior to the next review period. This list will become your action plan for improvement or the program or service.

Comments

1. Provide any comments about the review or review process that you believe should be documented in the summary form. Again, if this is the first time the unit or program has been reviewed, type “NA” in the box.

Actions Planned by the University

1. Check as many boxes as appropriate.

Signature List

1. List the names of the people who need to “sign off” on the review summary form.

Summary Form Submission

Once the summary form has been completed, press the Submit button found at the bottom of the form to save the report and submit it to the data file. You will be taken to a printable version of the form once it has been submitted.

**NOTE: ONCE THE FORM HAS BEEN SAVED, YOU CANNOT GO BACK AND CHANGE ANY OF THE ENTRIES. PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU COMPLETE ALL OF YOUR EDITS AND REVISIONS BEFORE THE REPORT IS SAVED AND SUBMITTED.**
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education  
Academic Program Review Summary Form – Internal Template  
Board Of Governors Policy 1986-04-A

University: (List all Universities)  
________________________________

Program Title:  
________________________________

Degree(s) Offered:  
________________________________

Division:  
________________________________

Date of Last Review: (Choose Month/Day/Year)

Completion Date of Current Review:  
(Choose Month/Day/Year)

I. Composition of Review Team

Chair:

External Review Team Members:

Campus Review Team Members:

II. Program Data - Insert other relevant program data related to the program review in the blank rows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insert Appropriate Academic Years Below</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year (est.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment – Annualized FTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget/Cost* (personnel, operating, equipment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Cost/FTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTEs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors Enrolled – Fall Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Either reflect the portion of the department’s budget (personnel, operating, and equipment) associated with this program, or reflect the Common Cost Accounting instructional costs associated with this program.
III. Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Progress Since Last Review (This should be a status report of the actions taken from the last review, if applicable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Steps Taken</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Outcomes Assessment (Board Policy 1997-01)

VI. Program Strengths

VII. Areas in Need of Improvement

VIII. Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Steps To Be Taken</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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