# Review Form for Undergraduate Programs Submitting Program Reviews in AY2021-22

Academic Unit:

Date of Review:

Reviewer (Name, Title & Institution):

## I. Purpose Statement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please rate the following program review criteria using the scale:  E = Exemplary; S = Satisfactory; N=Needs Improvement; U=Unclear | Evaluation  E, S, N, U |
| I.A. The degree program’s purpose statement adequately summarizes the scope of the program.  *Comments:* |  |
| I.B. The degree program’s purpose statement adequately summarizes the content studied, the skills developed, and/or the learning experience(s) provided.  *Comments:* |  |
| I.C. The degree program’s purpose statement adequately summarizes future opportunities for which it prepares students.  *Comments:* |  |
| I.C. If applicable: The degree program’s purpose statement adequately describes the unique content studied, skills developed, and/or learning experience(s) provided within emphasis areas, concentrations, tracks, etc. (*Mark N/A if Not Applicable*)  *Comments:* |  |

## II. Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes

| Please rate the following program review criteria using the scale:  E = Exemplary; S = Satisfactory; N=Needs Improvement; U=Unclear | Evaluation  E, S, N, U |
| --- | --- |
| II.A. The degree program’s student learning outcomes are explicit.  *Comments:* |  |
| II.B. The degree program’s student learning outcomes are learning-centered.  *Comments:* |  |
| II.C. The academic program’s student learning outcomes are aligned with the degree program purpose.  *Comments:* |  |
| II.D. The academic program’s student learning outcomes are appropriate to the level of the degree offered (e.g., Master’s degree outcomes are more rigorous than Bachelor’s degree outcomes).  *Comments:* |  |
| II.E. For degree programs having emphases: the outcomes capture the learning associated with both the common and unique curricular requirements of the degree.  *Comments:* |  |

## III. Curriculum Design: Curriculum Map and Written Description of the Curriculum

III.A. Rate whether the Curriculum Map includes

(1) all courses required for the degree program, including those outside of the prefix of the academic unit; (2) all degree program student learning outcomes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Maps all degree program course requirements to all program student learning outcomes | Maps only a sub-set of program student learning outcomes to degree program (Major) course requirements; Maps only a sub-set of degree program (Major) course requirements to program student learning outcomes |

*Comments:*

For Degree Programs with Emphases:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Maps a “common core” set of program student learning outcomes to course requirements for all emphases AND Maps a unique set of program student learning outcomes to course requirements for each emphasis | Does not map a “common core” of program student learning outcomes to course requirements for all emphases or a unique set of program student learning outcomes to course requirements for each emphasis |

*Comments:*

III.B. Based on your review of the curriculum map, rate the structure and sequencing of the curriculum:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Highly Proficient 🞏** | **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** | **Undeveloped 🞏** |
| Curriculum has a coherent sequencing and structure; students and faculty of the program can articulate the reasons behind the structure and sequencing; prerequisites are logical and reasonable | Well-structured curriculum with later coursework building logically on prerequisite courses | Has minimal structure with some prerequisites and sequencing of courses | No coherent structure to curriculum |

*Comments:*

## Systematic Assessment

## Step 1. Describe where, when and how assessment evidence was collected

Rate whether all broad learning outcomes were assessed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| The plan was designed to assess ALL broad learning outcomes. | The plan was NOT designed to assess ALL broad learning outcomes. |

*Comments:*

Rate whether most assessment took place at or toward the end of the program of study.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| The plan was designed to assess most (if not all) learning outcomes at or toward the end of the student’s program of study. | The plan was NOT designed to assess most (if not all) learning outcomes at or toward the end of the student’s program of study. |

*Comments:*

Rate the description of the assessment design:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| The description of the assessment design was detailed enough for the audience to fully understand.  A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely be able to replicate the completion of the assessment design and data collection based on the information provided. | The description of the assessment design was not detailed enough for the audience to fully understand.  A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely NOT be able to replicate the completion of the assessment design and data collection based on the information provided. |

*Comments:*

## Step 2. Design outcome measures

Rate the use of direct measures of student learning outcomes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Direct measures of assessment were used to evaluate most, if not all, broad student learning outcomes.  *If indirect measures were used, they were either (a) used in addition to direct measures, or (b) for learning outcomes wherein direct measures would not be possible to collect.* | Direct measures were NOT used to evaluate most, if not all, broad student learning outcomes.  *Indirect measures were used even though it would be possible to gather direct measures of student learning for the learning outcome.* |

*Comments:*

Rate the clarity of the evaluation of the assessment design:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| The evaluation of the assessment design was clear and detailed enough for an external audience, or a new chair or leader, to fully understand. | The evaluation of the assessment design was NOT clear and detailed enough for an external audience, or a new chair or leader, to fully understand. |

*Comments:*

Rate the usefulness of assessment results to improve the curriculum:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Based on the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment design program faculty have a clear pathway for understanding how best to (a) use their assessment results to identify strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and/or  (b) improve their assessment in the future. | Based on the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment design program faculty will likely have difficulties understanding how best to:  (a) use their assessment results to identify strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and/or  (b) improve their assessment in the future. |

*Comments:*

Rate either the strength (validity/reliability) of the assessment design:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Description revealed a strong (valid/reliable) assessment design, **and, where appropriate,** identified approaches to address any weaknesses in the assessment in order to improve it in the future. | Description revealed a weak (not valid and/or reliable) assessment design.  The description did **NOT** identify approaches to address assessment design weaknesses in the future. |

Other observations concerning the assessment approach: What other considerations of strengths and weaknesses were not included in the report that would assist the faculty in conducting useful and meaningful assessment in the future?

## Step 3. Data Collection: Gathering, Evaluation, Storage

Rate the description of gathering student work (assignments/exams/etc.).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| The description of the process used to gather assessment materials from students was detailed enough for the audience to fully understand.  A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely be able to replicate the approach for data collection based on the information provided. | The description of the process used to gather assessment materials from students was not detailed enough for the audience to fully understand.  A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely not be able to replicate the approach for data collection based on the information provided. |

*Comments:*

Rate the description of evaluating student work (assignments/exams/etc.).

| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| --- | --- |
| The description of the approaches used to evaluate assessment results provided clear standards (acceptable level of student achievement) for each measure, and clearly described why the standard (acceptable level of student achievement) was selected. | The description of the approaches used to evaluate assessment results did not include a clear description of the standards (acceptable level of student achievement) used for each measure. |

*Comments:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Specific scores or ratings were collected and examined, which provided the opportunity to explore strengths and weaknesses of student learning within the broad learning outcome. | Only overall ratings were collected and examined, which did NOT provide the opportunity to explore strengths and weaknesses within the broad learning outcome. |

*Comments:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| A new chair or leader coming into the unit would be able to replicate the approach for data collection based on the information provided, as standards were set by the faculty in the area, and are clear enough to replicate. | A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely not be able to replicate the approach for data collection based on the information provided, as standards were set by an individual instructor and are unclear to the area’s faculty. |

*Comments:*

Rate the description of storing student work (assignments/exams/etc.).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| The description of the process used to store assessment materials from students was detailed enough for the audience to fully understand.  A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely be able to replicate the approach for data storage based on the information provided. | The description of the process used to store assessment materials from students was not detailed enough for the audience to fully understand.  A new chair or leader coming into the unit would likely not be able to replicate the approach for data storage based on the information provided. |

## Step 4. Analysis & Interpretation of Findings

Rate the description of the faculty interpretations of findings.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Based on the interpretation of the assessment findings, faculty have a clear pathway for understanding how best to (a) use their assessment results to identify strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and/or  (b) improve their assessment in the future. | Based on the interpretation of the assessment findings, faculty do NOT have a clear pathway for understanding how best to (a) use their assessment results to identify strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and/or  (b) improve their assessment in the future. |

Comments:

Rate the strength (validity) of the faculty interpretations of findings:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Description revealed a strong (valid) interpretation of assessment findings, **and, where appropriate,** identified approaches to address any weaknesses in the assessment in order to improve it in the future. | Description revealed a weak (not valid) interpretation of assessment findings.  The description did **NOT** identify approaches to address assessment design weaknesses in the future. |

Comments:

Other observations concerning the interpretations:

*What additional interpretations do you, as a committee member, observe that were not included in the report and would assist faculty in using their assessment results to improve their curriculum or their assessment endeavors?*

## Step 5. Continual Improvement: Use of Findings

Rate the use of findings:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proficient 🞏** | **Developing 🞏** |
| Identified at least one action (improve assessment, improve curriculum, or disseminate findings) for EACH broad learning outcome. | Did not identify at least one action (improve assessment, improve curriculum, or disseminate findings) for each broad learning outcome. |

Comments:

Other observations concerning how the program could improve their assessment, improve their curriculum, and/or disseminate findings:

*What additional observations do you have that were not included in the report that would assist faculty to improve their assessment, their curriculum, or disseminate findings?*