WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

2025 - 2030

Academic Program Review

Contents

Academic Program Review Proposal

Overview

Academic program reviews are the main tool for holistic academic program improvement at Wright State University. They provide an opportunity for leadership to step back from the daily and annual management of the program to reflect on accomplishments and progress since the last program review, assess current strengths and weaknesses, and engage in long-term planning for the future. The academic program review process brings together strategic planning, outcome assessment trends, and internal and external environmental factors. Using this process, academic leaders can facilitate strategic planning and academic program development at the unit and college level and inform planning processes at the institutional level. Through the academic program review process, the University systematically engages in a continuous improvement model, resulting in relevant and quality academic programming.

Academic program reviews provide an opportunity to:

- Clarify goals, assess goal achievement, and evaluate future directions;
- Review policies, processes, and records;
- Assess student learning and success outcomes that lead to data-informed decisions regarding improvements in courses, curricula, and methodology and/or support requests for additional program resources;
- Help University leadership develop a better sense of current programs and make more informed decisions regarding strategic planning.

Following a holistic approach to continuous academic program improvement allows Wright State University to achieve our mission and stay relevant as an institution of higher education serving the Miami Valley. The process also aligns with criteria set forth by Wright State University's accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

Academic Program Review Cycle

The academic program review cycle will be five years. Year One will include the Academic Program Review; Year Two is Assessment Planning & Curriculum Modifications; Years Three through Five are the Learning Outcomes Assessment. Programs will *not* submit learning outcome assessments in Years One and Two.

Year One – Academic Program Review (APR)

The APR self-study will be prepared by program leadership and faculty (i.e., the program/department Chair or Director, the college Dean, etc.). Drafting of the self-study may also be assigned by the department/school Chair or the college Dean to a specific faculty member or faculty members. The contents of the self-study, however, should represent diverse perspectives within the program/academic unit. This process can be one of the most valuable aspects of the academic program review as it allows the program faculty to be reflective of the program as a whole. The Self-Study Template is provided in Appendix A.

Programs completing reviews for programmatic accreditation may use their accreditation self-study as part of the program review self-study. For such programs, program leadership can copy/paste those sections to the

program review, and only include information "in full" for sections not addressed in the programmatic accreditation review.

The final self-study document and supporting evidence must be submitted via Planning & Self Study (PSS). Feedback on drafts may be provided by Assessment & Accreditation, the Department/School Chair, and/or the College Dean. The Chair and Dean will approve the final report by March 1. The Assurance of Learning Committee will review and assess the report according to the rubric provided in Appendix B. This report will be provided to program leadership and to the Office of the Provost by March 30.

Recommended Timeline – 13 months (March 1 through March 30)
- Month 1 - Introductory meeting with department and program leadership and other faculty assigned to program review.
- Month 1 - Training for program leadership and/or faculty assigned to program review. Training will cover the Planning & Self Study (PSS) system for program reviews, curriculum mapping, and strategic planning.
- Months 3, 6, 9 - Assessment & Accreditation check-in with department and program leadership.
- Month 13 - Program review due to Assurance of Learning (AoL) committee by March 1.
- Month 13 - AoL report due to the Office of the Provost by March 30.

Year Two – Assessment Planning & Curriculum Modification
Through writing the APR, the program will identify a number of action items to improve the program. Year Two is reserved to focus on addressing quality, integrity, and continuous program improvement via long-term planning. This year is reserved for program leadership and faculty to:

- Submit curricular modifications for the program and/or courses through the curricular approval process managed in Curriculog.
- Develop a three-year outcomes assessment plan to continue monitoring student learning outcomes, quality, and integrity of the program.
  - Assess at least one-third of program learning outcomes each year.
  - Assess each program learning outcome with at least three direct measures of student learning, one from each of three levels (introductory, reinforcement, mastery) of courses within the curriculum.
  - This assessment plan will be built and/or updated in PSS.
- If a program strategic plan is developed, it should also be documented in PSS.
- Identify resources that may be needed to implement planned actions. Requests for resources should include data from the APR.

The results of Year Two are documented in PSS, Curriculog, or through resource request systems. Specific Action Items should be updated in PSS to provide a Year Two Report to the Office of the Provost by March 30.

Recommended Timeline – 12 months (April 1 through March 30)
- Month 1 - Training and documentation provided to program leadership and faculty in building the assessment plan and strategic plan (if used) in PSS.
- Months 3, 6, 9 - Assessment & Accreditation check-in with department and program leadership.
- Month 12 - Report submission due to the Office of the Provost by March 30.

Years Three to Five – Learning Outcomes Assessment

In Years Three through Five, the program leadership and faculty will continue to carry out their identified actions for continuous program improvement and follow the learning outcomes assessment plan developed in Year Two. Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment reports will open on December 1 and are due by September 30, resulting in some overlap of Year Five into the Academic Program Review for the next cycle.

Learning Outcomes Assessment will not be required of programs in Years One or Two of this cycle.

Using External Reviewers

A program may choose to use an external reviewer. This decision should be made in consultation with the College Dean and Provost. All costs, including both stipend and travel, for an external reviewer will be incurred by the department/school or college and must be approved according to university policy. External reviewers will be selected by the Vice Provost for Assessment and Chief Accreditation Officer in consultation with program and college leadership.

Participation of the external reviewer may be virtual or in-person. The reviewer should have the opportunity to meet with varied stakeholders and constituents, such as program faculty (i.e., full-time, part-time, tenure track, tenured), staff, current students and alumni, community partners, and representatives of the Dean's office and Academic Affairs.

The external reviewer will complete the academic program review assessment rubric as part of its evaluation and may respond to specific questions or concerns provided in advance. In addition, the reviewer will be responsible for issuing an executive summary of their overall findings, including an overview of a program's strengths, opportunities for improvement, and recommendations for the future. The reviewer report (i.e., executive summary and completed assessment rubric) will be submitted to Vice Provost for Assessment and Chief Accreditation Officer no later than 30 days following the site visit.

Academic Program Review Schedule

At most, program leadership will participate in academic program reviews on a five-year cycle. For those programs with specialized accreditation, efforts will be made to sync specialized accreditation reviews with Wright State's academic program reviews to reduce redundancies and alleviate administrative burdens.

The schedule of individual academic program reviews will occur on a 5-year cycle by program or department. The schedule strives for a balanced distribution of reviews across colleges, and, for some programs, will need to be appropriately aligned with specialized accreditation requirements. Program leadership may provide input on the need for flexibility or special scheduling considerations. Examples of factors that may impact the academic program review include:

- Timing of programmatic accreditation reviews and site visits
- Substantive program changes
- Program suspension or closure
- Special circumstances relating to a combined or multi-program review

Table 1 displays a 5-year schedule by college. All programs with a given department/unit will be reviewed in a given year, unless an alternative schedule necessitated by an accreditation site visit, as noted above.

Table 1. *Academic Program Review (Year One) Schedule*

2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
CHEH - Social Work COLA - FPA COSM - All except BIO, BMB, CHM Lake - All associate programs and independent bachelor's programs RSCOB - All except MIS-BSB	CHEH - Nursing - Human Services - Athletic Training COLA - HCS - SSIS - College-based programs Lake - Certificate programs - Bachelor's degrees with COLA - General Studies BSOM - PPH - Pharm Tox	Co-Curricular CHEH - Aviation COSM - Chemistry GPHS	CHEH - Health & Exercise Sciences - Leadership Studies - SOPP - Teacher Education CECS – All Lake - Teacher Education - Engineering COSM - Biological Sciences RSCOB – MIS BSB	BSOM - Medicine COSM - BMB

Summary

Program review is a data-driven process that assesses the overall quality and operational health of programs. The review process focuses on program quality and program efficiency, as established by the Higher Learning Commission. Academic program review is meant to ensure Wright State University provides distinctive, high quality programs through serious self-reflection on program strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement.

Appendix A: Self-Study Template

The following self-study questions are included with the Program Review template in Planning & Self Study. Linkages for data across Watermark systems (Smart Connections) are relatively easy to create as are external links. Additional documents can be uploaded to Planning & Self Study and linked within the final report. [Help for Program Review Contributors](#) is available through Watermark Support.

SELF-STUDY QUESTIONS

Please answer questions succinctly and provide evidence. The Higher Learning Commission's Criteria for Accreditation are referenced to the specific questions for which they apply.

A. Introduction & Program Context

1. Institutional Alignment and Program Context (**PSS Smart Connection**: Program & Institutional Mission Statements) - Criterion 1.A.
   - Describe the program, including its overarching purpose/goal/mission and its preparation of students for future activities, for example, graduate/professional schools or workforce.
   - Highlight the types of programs/career fields for which the program prepares students. Describe the program mission and its connection to the institutional mission and vision.
   - Include the program's 2024 business plan and describe how it aligns with the college and university strategic plans and mission statements.
   - Include an outcome map from PSS showing how program learning outcomes align to institutional learning outcomes.

2. Mission and Public Good - Criterion 1.B.
   - How has the program identified and engaged with external constituencies and communities of interest (i.e., advisory boards and program alumni), responding to their needs as its mission and capacities allow?
   - How do the student learning outcomes align with industry and Ohio Workforce needs?
   - What are emerging trends in the program discipline? What is happening in industries related to this discipline?

3. Organization & Structure of the Department – Criteria 1.C, 2.A., & 4.A.
   - Describe the administrative structures connected to this program (program director, curriculum committees, etc.). Describe how they facilitate collaborative processes such as data-informed decision-making and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.
   - What evidence can you provide that these structures are effective?
   - Provide evidence that the program operates with integrity and establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and procedures in its operation.

4. External Accreditation
   - Is external accreditation available for the program?
     a. If so, does the program maintain such accreditation? If applicable, provide the name of the accreditation body, date of most recent review, status of review, and date of the next scheduled review.

b. If not, identify why programmatic accreditation is not appropriate for the program.

B. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment & Curriculum

1. Educational Program – Criterion 3.A.
   - What are the program's learning outcomes and objectives? How do the course student learning outcomes align with industry needs?
   - Provide evidence that the program's courses and offerings' outcomes and objectives are current (identify when last updated via Curriculog) and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
   - Provide evidence that permanently or regularly cross-listed courses differentiate between undergraduate and graduate-level work.
   - Provide evidence that quality and learning outcomes are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (campuses, online, dual-credit, contractual or consortia arrangements).
   - Provide name(s) of institutions with contractual or consortia arrangements and when the agreement was approved. When was the arrangement last reviewed?

2. Curriculum and Outcome Maps (*PSS Smart Connection*: Curriculum Map) – Criteria 2.B., 3.A., & 3.F.
   - Include a curriculum map from PSS showing the arc of learning (introduction, reinforcement, mastery) through the curriculum.
   - Provide evidence that the departmental courses within the program have objectives and outcomes written using standardized language (may require an update via Curriculog).
   - Describe the plan of study (POS) or course pathway students take to achieve this program degree. The POS should explain any differences between full- and part-time students, when the POS is developed and submitted, and how students are guided in the POS process and any revisions. Highlight any key or core courses, have any changes been made to this pathway or degree requirements over the course of this cycle?
   - Provide evidence that the POS aligns with or is the published GPS in the Catalog. When was the GPS last updated? Confirm that it is current and accurate.

3. Assessment of Student Learning (*PSS Smart Connection*: Outcomes data from Assessment Plans) – Criterion 3.E.
   - Ensure that the program outcomes used for assessment of student learning match those published in Catalog. Explain any discrepancies and a plan to align the outcomes.
   - Attach the program's assessment reports for the past three years; include questions for additional location(s) and alternative modalities if appropriate.
   - Describe how these outcomes pertain to the program's mission. Have any changes been made to these outcomes over the course of this review cycle? Why or why not?
   - Describe the extent to which students in the program have met these outcomes.

4. Assessment of Student Learning – Quality, Measures, and Results (*PSS Smart Connection*: Measures and Results data from Assessment Plans) – Criterion 3.E.
   - How does the program ensure that its quality and learning outcomes are consistent across all modes of delivery (e.g., face-to-face, online) and all locations (Dayton and Lake)?
   - Discuss how each learning outcome is measured. Why were these measures chosen? Were any measures or assessment instruments changed over the course of this cycle? Why or why not? Will different measures be chosen the next time this outcome is assessed?

- Summarize and discuss the results of the program's measures over the course of this cycle. Have the results demonstrated improvement or mastery of this outcome? Why or why not?

5. Exercise of Intellectual Inquiry – Criterion 3.B.
   - Describe how the program's students engage in the following:
     a. Collect, analyze, and communicate information
     b. Master modes of inquiry or creative work
     c. Develop skills adaptable to changing environments
   - Provide evidence that the program's students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate.

6. Transfer Information (Undergraduate Only) – Criterion 2.B.
   - Describe how this program is transfer-friendly. Include links to posted Transfer Assurance Guides and note when they were last updated. Have any changes been made to transfer guides or course equivalencies since the last review? Please explain.

7. General Education (Undergraduate Only)
   - If applicable, please describe how courses in your program contribute to the university's General Education program.

C. Student Experience

1. Support for Student Learning – Criterion 3.D.
   - Who advises students? How does this model support student learning and success?
   - For undergraduate programs, how is communication maintained with centralized advising?

2. Co-Curricular Opportunities – Criteria 1.C. & 3.E.
   - If applicable, describe any co-curricular or community engagement opportunities offered by the program that contribute to the educational experience of its students, i.e., program-sponsored activities (optional or required) aligned with the curriculum to support student learning.
     a. Research
     b. Internships or Field Experiences
     c. Service or civic engagement
     d. Honors
   - How are co-curricular or community engagement opportunities assessed?

3. Knowledge Acquisition and Application – Criterion 2.E.
   - What guidance and mentoring does the program offer to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by the program's students?
   - In addition to university-established policies concerning academic honesty and integrity, does the program have any other relevant policies that it follows?
   - What guidance does the program offer in both the ethical and effective use of information resources?

4. Student Success Outcomes – Criterion 3.G.
   - Provide an analysis of the data for trends in enrollment, retention and graduation (see Program Data section, part F below). The analysis could:
     - Examine and evaluate enrollment trends in the program – discuss how the program improved coordination of recruitment efforts with your college or other campus offices

(e.g. Graduate School, Enrollment Management). Include any plans the program has for increasing enrollment.

- Examine correlations that may exist between types of instructors teaching courses and student success. I.e., Is there a trend in the type of instructors teaching courses with high DFW rates?
- Undergraduate programs: Examine and evaluate the retention rate and graduation rates. Discuss how the program has improved the coordination of retention efforts with student success offices (advising, support services, etc.).
- Graduate programs: Examine and evaluate the time to degree completion for the program. Discuss how timely degree completion is supported.

5. Post-Graduate Success – Criterion 3.G.
   - How does the program evaluate the success of its graduates? Are graduates of the program prepared for advanced study or employment? What are the indicators used to confirm this?
   - Describe findings and results from any exit surveys or program alumni surveys that were conducted over the course of the cycle. Highlight any trends or insights that came from exit surveys over the course of the cycle.

D. Program Analysis & Summary

1. Planning for Quality Improvement (**PSS Smart Connection**: Actions pulled from Assessment Plans) – Criterion 4.C.
   - Summarize or highlight action items taken from the program's assessment results during this review cycle. How have the results driven improvements throughout this cycle?

2. Based on the completion of the review, identify program strengths and opportunities as well as specific goals for the next five-year review cycle. Include the metrics that will be used to assess progress toward, or completion of, the stated goals and any alignments with broader strategic plans, if applicable.

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS FOR SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

A. **Program/Department Mission Statement & Strategic Plan**
   The program's mission statement should be entered in Planning & Self Study and should include a description of how it aligns with the College and University strategic plan and mission statement.

   If the program/department does not have a formal mission statement, please include an overview/description of the program's goals in support of the college's strategic plan.

   A data-informed strategic enrollment plan should be developed to highlight expected new and continuing enrollment over the next five years.

B. **Curriculum Map**
   Undergraduate programs must build a curriculum map in Planning & Self Study that highlights how course content introduces, reinforces, or assesses mastery of the program learning outcomes.

C. **Outcomes Maps**
   All programs should map program learning outcomes to Institutional Learning Outcomes. Additionally, course learning outcomes can be mapped to Program Learning Outcomes to show alignment of the curriculum.

D. **Plans of Study**
   Attach the plan of study (POS), which should explain any differences that may exist between full- and part-time students, when the POS is developed and submitted, and how students are guided in the POS process and any revisions.

E. **Assessment Plan**
   Assessment plans will be built in Planning & Self Study. Plans should identify the measures and targets used to assess each program learning outcome. Each outcome should be assessed with multiple measures that include at least one direct measurement of student learning.

F. **Assessment Report**
   Link the program's assessment reports for the past three years; include questions for additional location(s) and alternative modalities if appropriate.

G. **Program Data**
   In collaboration and consultation with program leadership, Institutional Research and Effectiveness will produce, at minimum, the following program-level data: headcount enrollment, DFW rates, degrees awarded, persistence rates, and time to program completion. These data will be included as supporting evidence in the self-study. Any concerns regarding data integrity should be raised with the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, who will collaborate with the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the Data Governance Council for further guidance and resolution.

H. **Optional**
   a. Transfer Assurance Guides (TAG) information from Ohio Department of Higher Education (undergraduate programs only).

Appendix B: Assessment Rubric

The Assurance of Learning committee will assess the final Academic Program Review (APR) reports according to the following rubric and provide additional qualitative feedback to the program leadership. The rubric-based assessment will provide aggregate and quantifiable data to track the progress of and assess Wright State's APR process and be used as evidence in future assurance arguments to HLC.

	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Unmet (0)	Comments
Introduction & Program Context				
The program's mission connects with the institutional vision and mission. (1.A)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence that program mission is suited to the context of the institution.	Provides partial supporting evidence that program mission is suited to the context of the institution.	Lacks evidence that the program mission is suited to the context of the institution.	
The program has identified and engaged with external constituencies and communities of interest, responding to their needs as its mission and capacities allow. (1.B.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of regular engagement and works with external constituents (e.g., community partners, legislature, employers).	Provides partial supporting evidence of regular engagement and works with external constituents (e.g., community partners, legislature, employers).	Lacks evidence of regular engagement and works with external constituents (e.g., community partners, legislature, employers).	
The program, including its overarching purpose/goals and its preparation of students for future activities serves the public good and responds to the needs of external constituencies. (1.B.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of its educational role to serve the public and engage with external constituencies.	Provides partial supporting evidence of its educational role to serve the public and engage with external constituencies.	Lacks evidence of its educational role to serve the public and engage with external constituencies.	
The program has effective administrative structures to facilitate collaborative processes such as data-informed decision-making and engagement with external and internal stakeholders. (4.A.)	Provides well-developed evidence that administrative structures are effective to facilitate collaborative processes with internal and external stakeholders.	Provides partial supporting evidence that administrative structures are effective to facilitate collaborative processes with internal and external stakeholders.	No evidence provided that administrative structures are effective to facilitate collaborative processes with internal and external stakeholders.	

	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Unmet (0)	Comments
The program operates with integrity, and establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and procedures. (2.A.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of how Integrity, fairness, and ethics are ensured in the development and administration of unit policies and procedures (e.g., policies are reviewed and adopted according to a democratic process, transparent and include appeal processes).	Provides partial supporting evidence of how Integrity, fairness, and ethics are ensured in the development and administration of unit policies and procedures (e.g., policies are reviewed and adopted according to a democratic process, transparent and include appeal processes).	Lacks evidence of how Integrity, fairness, and ethics are ensured in the development and administration of unit policies and procedures (e.g., policies are reviewed and adopted according to a democratic process, transparent and include appeal processes).	
The program has identified the available external accreditation options for its degrees and maintains such accreditation wherever applicable.	Program identified external accrediting body, or provided well-developed supporting evidence of why program accreditation is not appropriate.	Program identified external accrediting body, or provided partial supporting evidence of why program accreditation is not appropriate.	Program unable to identify external accrediting body, or lacks evidence of why program accreditation is not appropriate.	
Enter sub-section points *(Possible points = 12; expected pts > 0)*				
Curriculum & Student Learning Outcomes Assessment				
The program has current learning objectives and outcomes that reflect a level of rigor commensurate with the degree and within the content of the courses in the educational program. (3.A)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence that degree and certificate programs are current (i.e., relevant, up-to-date) and the process by which the program ensures expectations for student work are commensurate with the level of the program (i.e., undergraduate, graduate).	Provides partial supporting evidence that degree and certificate programs are current (i.e., relevant, up-to-date) and the process by which the program ensures expectations for student work are commensurate with the level of the program (i.e., undergraduate, graduate).	Lacks evidence that degree and certificate programs are current (i.e., relevant, up-to-date) and the process by which the program ensures expectations for student work are commensurate with the level of the program (i.e., undergraduate, graduate).	

	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Unmet (0)	Comments
The program ensures that its quality and learning objectives and outcomes for the program and courses are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (campuses, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality). (3.A)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence that courses and programs offered in a variety of settings and delivery modes (e.g., on campus, online, dual credit, alternative locations) are of the same quality and curriculum.	Provides partial supporting evidence that courses and programs offered in a variety of settings and delivery modes (e.g., on campus, online, dual credit, alternative locations) are of the same quality and curriculum.	Lacks evidence that courses and programs offered in a variety of settings and delivery modes (e.g., on campus, online, dual credit, alternative locations) are of the same quality and curriculum.	
The program engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to the changing environment. (3.B.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of how program courses, curricula, and/or other educational opportunities and experiences help students develop a sense of information literacy and flexible and adaptable cognitive skills.	Provides partial supporting evidence of how program courses, curricula, and/or other educational opportunities and experiences help students develop a sense of information literacy and flexible and adaptable cognitive skills.	Lacks evidence of how program courses, curricula, and/or other educational opportunities and experiences help students develop a sense of information literacy and flexible and adaptable cognitive skills.	
The program presents itself accurately and completely to students (current, prospective, and transfer) and the public concerning its educational programs and any claims it makes related to the educational experience. (2.B.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence that courses and programs offered in a variety of settings and delivery modes (e.g., on campus, online, dual credit, alternative locations) are of the same quality and curriculum.	Provides partial supporting evidence that courses and programs offered in a variety of settings and delivery modes (e.g., on campus, online, dual credit, alternative locations) are of the same quality and curriculum.	Lacks evidence that courses and programs offered in a variety of settings and delivery modes (e.g., on campus, online, dual credit, alternative locations) are of the same quality and curriculum.	
The program gathers and analyzes data about student learning and uses this information to make improvements as warranted by the data. (3.E.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of how data is obtained and regularly used for program improvements.	Provides partial supporting evidence of how data is obtained and regularly used for program improvements.	Lacks evidence of how data is obtained and regularly used for program improvements.	

	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Unmet (0)	Comments
The program improves its quality based on its assessment of student learning. (3.E.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of a continuous improvement model being used to improve performance in all areas.	Provides partial supporting evidence of a continuous improvement model being used to improve performance in all areas.	Lacks evidence of a continuous improvement model being used to improve performance in all areas.	
The program's students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate. (3.B.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of opportunities, including independent study, capstone project, honors thesis, and can explain why the opportunities available are appropriate for the degree program.	Provides partial supporting evidence of opportunities, including independent study, capstone project, honors thesis, and can explain why the opportunities available are appropriate for the degree program.	Lacks evidence of opportunities, including independent study, capstone project, honors thesis, and can explain why the opportunities available are appropriate for the degree program.	
If applicable, the program contributes to the general education program of the University.	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of approved general education courses and the general education area for which they are approved.	Provides partial supporting evidence of approved general education courses and the general education area for which they are approved.	Lacks evidence of approved general education courses and the general education area for which they are approved.	
Enter sub-section points *(Possible points = 16; expected pts > 0)*				

Student Experience

	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Unmet (0)	Comments
The program has access to student support services and teaching resources necessary for student success. (3.D.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of the resources necessary for teaching and learning (e.g., classrooms, faculty-student meeting space, administrative support).	Provides partial supporting evidence of the resources necessary for teaching and learning (e.g., classrooms, faculty-student meeting space, administrative support).	Lacks evidence of the resources necessary for teaching and learning (e.g., classrooms, faculty-student meeting space, administrative support).	
The program ensures academic advising and resources suited to its programs and the needs of its students are available and current. (3.D.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of how academic advising occurs and why this model is appropriate for meeting students' needs.	Provides partial supporting evidence of how academic advising occurs and why this model is appropriate for meeting students' needs.	Lacks evidence of how academic advising occurs and why this model is appropriate for meeting students' needs.	

	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Unmet (0)	Comments
The program ensures that its instructors are accessible for student inquiry. (3.D.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence that students have access to faculty. Faculty are required to hold office hours and/or list contact information on syllabi.	Provides partial supporting evidence that students have access to faculty. Faculty are required to hold office hours and/or list contact information on syllabi.	Lacks evidence that students have access to faculty. Faculty are required to hold office hours and/or list contact information on syllabi.	
If applicable, co-curricular or community engagement opportunities are offered that contribute to the educational experience of the program's students. (1.C.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of co-curricular and community engagement opportunities (e.g., service learning courses, other program events) for students.	Provides partial supporting evidence of co-curricular and community engagement opportunities (e.g., service learning courses, other program events) for students.	Lacks evidence of co-curricular and community engagement opportunities (e.g., service learning courses, other program events) for students.	
The program adheres to policies and procedures that ensure responsible acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge. (2.E.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of processes for how/when information about ethics and integrity of conducting research is provided to students.	Provides partial supporting evidence of processes for how/when information about ethics and integrity of conducting research is provided to students.	Lacks evidence of processes for how/when information about ethics and integrity of conducting research is provided to students.	
The program offers support to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by the program's students. (2.E)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of processes for how/when information about ethics and integrity of conducting research is provided to students.	Provides partial supporting evidence of processes for how/when information about ethics and integrity of conducting research is provided to students.	Lacks evidence of processes for how/when information about ethics and integrity of conducting research is provided to students.	
The program has established policies with respect to academic honesty and integrity. (2.E)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of academic honesty and integrity policies, and how the program ensures academic integrity policies are communicated to faculty and students.	Provides partial supporting evidence of academic honesty and integrity policies, and how the program ensures academic integrity policies are communicated to faculty and students.	Lacks evidence of academic honesty and integrity policies, and how the program ensures academic integrity policies are communicated to faculty and students.	
The program offers its students guidance in both the ethical and effective use of information resources. (2.E)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of processes for how/when information about ethical and effective use of information resources is provided to students.	Provides partial supporting evidence of processes for how/when information about ethical and effective use of information resources is provided to students.	Lacks evidence of processes for how/when information about ethical and effective use of information resources is provided to students.	

The program gathers and analyzes data about student retention, persistence, and completion in its degree programs, and uses this information to make improvements as warranted by the data. (3.G.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of how data is obtained and regularly used for program improvements.	Provides partial supporting evidence of how data is obtained and regularly used for program improvements.	Lacks evidence of how data is obtained and regularly used for program improvements.	
Using appropriate indicators, the program evaluates the success of its graduates, including whether its degree and certificate programs prepare students for advanced study or employment. (3.G.)	Provides well-developed supporting evidence of engagement in degree program assessment with identified indicators for evaluation.	Provides partial supporting evidence of engagement in degree program assessment with identified indicators for evaluation.	Lacks evidence of engagement in degree program assessment with identified indicators for evaluation.	

Enter sub-section points *(Possible points = 20; expected pts > 0)*	

Program Analysis & Summary

After reading the program self-study, how would you characterize the quality and performance of the program?

Does the program have a coherent design characterized by continuity, breadth, sequential progression, and a synthesis of learning?

What are the program's strengths? In what ways could the program be considered a leader in its field?

What are the program's challenges and opportunities? What are the program's weaknesses and where could it most improve? What further challenges do you foresee the program facing in the coming years? What do you see as the major obstacles that impede the program's progress?

Based on the findings of this self-study, what should be the core objectives and priorities for the department/program over the next five years?

Total Rubric points *(Possible points = 48)*	