San Jose State University Program Planning Guidelines

1. AUTHORITY

These guidelines are published pursuant to University Policy S94-2, "Organization of the Program Planning Process at SJSU", as amended by S96-10, "Program Planning Process" and F03-4, “Coordination of External Accreditation with Program Planning.” Policy statements shall prevail in case of any conflict with these guidelines. These guidelines are also guided by University Policy S93-14 "Curricular Priorities.”

2. PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS

The unit of analysis is the program, defined as a sequence of studies leading to a degree, minor, certificate or teaching credential. Whenever separate descriptions are provided in the University catalog for similar sequences of study, they are treated as different programs to be reviewed. Concentrations are considered to be specialized variants of a more general field and are reviewed under the degree programs. Teacher education programs meeting the requirements of the California Commission on Teacher Credential (CCTC) are reviewed as programs. Minors are reviewed with the degree or program to which they most closely relate.

Program planning is evidence-based and future-oriented; program goals and objectives should guide assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty hiring, student recruitment and retention efforts, research, scholarship or creative activities (RSCA) by the faculty, and interaction with the community. Program planning and evaluation involve faculty at the department, college, and university levels and culminate with the Provost's approval of clearly articulated goals and a corresponding framework for resource management. Typical questions to bear in mind include:

- What changes in career opportunities, professional practice, technology, or other relevant discipline characteristics are students completing this program likely to face?
- What changes are expected in the characteristics or academic backgrounds of students coming into the program?
- What changes in the curriculum (e.g., for lifelong learning, good citizenship, living in a complex, multicultural society, etc.) should be considered better prepare future students for jobs?
- What modes of instructional delivery will best help students achieve program outcomes?
- What faculty recruitment and development opportunities are needed to support the program?
- What changes in support resources (e.g., staff, equipment, infrastructure, travel funds, etc.) are needed to maintain or change the program quality, size, and achievement of student learning outcomes and RSCA?

a. Program Planning for Accredited Programs

In accordance with University Policy F03-4, the Program Planning Committee (PPC) coordinates the timing of program reviews with those of external accreditation agencies. Programs normally are scheduled for review once every seven academic years except for programs that have an accreditation cycle that is other than seven years. According to University Policy F03-4, the program planning cycle for accredited programs will be coordinated with accreditation cycle. For programs that have extremely long accreditation cycles (e.g. 10 years),
programs or the dean may request review by the program planning committee halfway through the cycle. For departments in which only some of the degree programs are accredited, the other programs will go through the program planning process at the same time as the accredited programs. The format of the self-study for accredited programs is discussed later in these guidelines.

b. Program Planning Procedures and Timeline

The primary steps and timeline in program planning are summarized in Table 1. The entire process should take no longer than 4 semesters to complete. Each step will be discussed in detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Summary of Program Planning Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with Dean to discuss the elements of the self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-provided data elements delivered to the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior to Dean Review, Chair of Program Planning approves the self-study.</strong> A check list will be included that ensuring that program adheres to the guidelines (page limits, GE included, Data elements included). Assemble all documents and information needed to prepare self-study. Self-Study is completed and sent to Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester 1/Semester 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean reviews and comments on the self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the vitae of three External Reviewers to the College Dean (in the case of accreditation reviews, this is handled by the accreditation agency). Dean ranks reviewers and forwards rankings to AVP-GUP. AVP-GUP selects external reviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewer visit and itinerary is created. Travel arrangements made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reviewer Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External review received electronically by GUP and Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to External Reviewer’s Report or memo indicating that no response is required from the department sent to College Dean and Office of GUP, electronically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All material provided to PPC for evaluation. PPC evaluates all material. Letter to Provost prepared and submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan meeting with Provost, department, Deputy Provost, AVP-GUP, AVP-Research, Program Planning Chair is held. Action plan is prepared and signed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process begins with the department (or program) faculty meeting with their dean to discuss the department’s strengths, weaknesses, areas of opportunity as they relate to the college and university’s vision and any strategic planning that has occurred within the department or college. The program in consultation with the dean will select an individual who will be responsible for writing of the self-study. After this meeting occurs, the department will prepare a document, called the self-study, describing past achievements, evaluating student learning assessment data, analyzing the current status of student demand and program resources and preparing future goals and priorities. This document will also include data elements that will be obtained from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics. Once the document is complete, it will be submitted to the dean for review, approval, and comments.

After the dean’s approval, the department will provide the CV’s for three external experts in the discipline to evaluate the program. The dean will review these CV’s and provide a rank order. The CV’s and rank order will be forwarded to Graduate and Undergraduate Program’s office where the AVP will pick an external reviewer. Details for the external reviewer process will be outlined in section d below.

The external reviewer will evaluate the program and submit a report. After the program faculty have had an opportunity to respond to the external reviewer’s report in writing, all of the documents are next reviewed by the University Program Planning Committee (PPC), which provides a university-wide perspective on the program and makes recommendations to the Provost. The department will be provided a copy of the letter to the provost and will schedule a meeting with the Provost to complete the overall process.

The Provost (or the Provost’s designee), dean, department chair and faculty, and the chair of the PPC will discuss program recommendations and develop an action plan. This action plan will be used to guide the department in its activities prior to the next review period.

The Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs will be the official site of records and is responsible for electronic distribution of materials to concerned entities.

1. **Responsibility for Self-Study**

   Detailed guidelines for preparing and formatting the self-study are outlined in Appendix 1. The department should designate one faculty member in consultation with the dean as Department Program Planning Coordinator who will be responsible for coordinating the development of each self-study. However, department chairs have the ultimate responsibility to ensure that all tasks necessary to develop a self-study are assigned and completed. Chairs are expected periodically to check on the progress made toward accomplishing those tasks, making adjustments as needed. Typically, the self-study should be completed and the external reviewer selected by the end of the first semester.
The designated person who is coordinating the self-study will receive 0.2 release time for writing the self-study. However, the release time funds will be transferred from the GUP office to the respective dean’s office only after the self-study is complete and submitted to the dean. It will be the responsibility of the dean’s office to ensure completion of the self-study in a timely fashion.

2. **External Reviewer Evaluation of Program**
   The external reviewer selection process and procedures can be found in Appendix 2 of this document. The reviewer prepares a written report after their visit of the program. The program will review this document and provide a written response. The reviewer’s report along with the response from the document are forwarded to the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs and is added to the self-study.

3. **Program Planning Committee Report.**
   The Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs notifies the Program Planning Committee Chair that all the material for a program review are available. PPC will review the materials based upon internal guidelines established by the committee. The PPC may recommend several actions to the Provost as defined in the Program Planning Policy.

4. **Action Plan Meeting**
   The Provost (or designee) will schedule a meeting with the Department, Dean, AVP-GUP, AVP-Research, Program Planning Chair and other administrators as needed. The outcome of the meeting will be an action plan document that will be kept in the Program Planning files and also in program and college files. This action plan will establish the program’s most important goals to accomplish prior to the next program planning cycle.

3. **APPENDICES**
   a. **Formatting the Self-Study**
      1. **Non-Accredited Programs**
         a. The self-study is to be organized according to the format described herein, which is in alignment with the Curricular Priorities statement in S93-14. The self-study can contain as many appendices as the department may wish beyond what is required, but the main text (the Sections 3 through 10) is to be no more than 25 pages for a department with one degree program.
         b. Departments that offer two or more degree programs, concentrations, or interdisciplinary programs in conjunction with other departments can add an additional five pages per program to the main text, appropriately expanding Sections 3 through 10. For example, a department with both an undergraduate and a graduate degree will have a maximum of 30 pages to incorporate both programs into Sections 3 through 10.
         c. The self-study will be submitted in an electronic format as a single PDF file.
Sections of the Self-Study

Within each section, the self-study should provide an analysis of the current status of the program(s), any changes since the previous program review, and expected or recommended changes for the next five years. All criteria must be fully discussed, and, to the extent possible, relevant assessment data should be used to support analyses. Appendices should be used for presentation of detailed data, while the narrative sections of the self-study should provide interpretation, context, perspective, and analysis.

A template with the material below will be provided and available on the program planning website.

1. TITLE PAGE

The title page should provide the name of the instructional unit, college, and department website. Department Chair or School Director, Faculty Program Plan Leader (if applicable), Date report is submitted to the Dean, and Semester that the report is due to the university PPC will be included underneath.

2. TABLE OF CONTENTS

The table of contents should include a listing of all sections and appendices of the self-study with corresponding page numbers. In the case of accredited programs, the table of contents will match the sections delineated here, while the page numbers will match the accreditation self-study report. The goal is for SJSU readers to be able to find the corresponding sections in the attached accreditation report. When accreditation agency criteria do not require, or inadequately address, one or more Program Planning criteria, the accreditation self-study must be supplemented accordingly. When a department has both accredited and non-accredited programs, a self-study is required for the non-accredited programs.

3. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Briefly describe each program in the report. List all degrees, concentrations, minors, certificates, and credential programs. State the year each program was implemented, location of department, accrediting agency (if accredited), and URL of department website.

   a. Program mission and goals
      Include a discussion of how the program(s) are aligned with the missions/goals of the college and university, and the scope of the review described in the self-study.

   b. Curricular Content of Degrees, Minors, Certificates, and Credentials
      Briefly describe the broad curricular areas encompassed by each program. For minors offered in the department, evaluate and discuss the importance of the minor as it meets the needs of students who declare the minor. For minors required as part of your degree programs, evaluate and discuss whether or not the minor is meeting the needs of your students. Include societal needs and/or employment opportunities served by each program, as relevant.

   c. GE and Service Courses
      If any program provides courses for other programs or general education, list them here and explain the role these courses play for other programs or societal needs, as relevant. Include any bottlenecks in the delivery of General Education and Service courses.
4. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS, CHANGES, AND PROPOSED ACTIONS

a. Synopsis of the Previous Program Review Recommendations or Action Plan
   ● Summarize progress on recommendations made in the last program review.
   ● Include the rationale for recommendations which were deferred or abandoned since the previous program review.
   ● Include any issues from the last review that are still pending. Refer to the appropriate section(s) in this self-study report where these issues are addressed.
   ● Include any resource support from the college and university in aid in enhancing the program or any loss of resources and support by the college or university that reduced the quality of program.

b. Synopsis of Program Annual Assessment
   ● Summarize briefly where the program is with respect to the annual assessment and feedback provided from the Director of Assessment. Provide in Appendix A the annual assessments for the time period of the program plan.

c. Synopsis of GE Annual Assessment
   ● Summarize briefly where the program is with respect to the annual assessment and feedback provided from the Director of Assessment. Provide in Appendix B the annual assessments completed for the time period of the program plan.

d. PE Waiver request.
   ● Submit justification for PE Waiver. Please see Senate Policy S14-11 and S13-3 for guidelines. The PPC may provide an evaluation of waiver in its recommendations to the Provost.

5. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Optional: If any programs are externally accredited and a recent accreditation report exists, it can be attached in an appendix and referred to by page number to minimize duplication of work.

a. Program Learning Objectives (PLO)
   ● Briefly summarize the current curriculum for each degree program. If an undergraduate program has a culminating experience or course, please include it here.
   ● For graduate degree programs, summarize the required culminating experiences (thesis, oral exam, written exam, etc.).
   ● Include catalog descriptions of each degree program in self-study Appendix C.
   ● Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULG). Provide a Matrix of PLOs to Courses that they are assessed in. These should be found in Appendix D.

b. Assessment Data and Interpretation
   ● Describe data collected for assessment of student learning and experience in the program. Actual data and assessment instruments should be located in Appendix E. The program plan should be based on a comprehensive data set encompassing all PLOs, ideally obtained within two years prior to the date of the report. Achievement of PLOs should be assessed using direct methods. Student experience can be assessed using indirect methods. Benchmarking
data, such as licensing examinations or national/regional standardized disciplinary examinations are also appropriate here.

- Evaluate and interpret PLOs with WASC PLO Rubric. If you are assessing capstone projects or portfolios, please refer to the WASC Rubrics for Capstones and Portfolios, respectively. Changes in student composition (i.e. SAT/eligibility index, URM/Non URM status) should be considered in the interpretation of the results. Evaluate (1) if students are consistently achieving PLOs upon graduation, (2) how SJSU students in program compare to students in comparable programs, if possible, and (3) if students have a positive academic experience in the program and at SJSU.

c. Placement of Graduates

An alumni survey or comparable method should be administered to determine where program graduates go upon graduation and provided in appendix F. In addition, it would be appropriate here to gather feedback on their perceived preparedness for the workforce, as well as reflections on curricular content.

d. Credit Hour Review

Report the results of your review of credit-hour assignments to ensure that your department is compliant with Senate Policy S12-3.

e. Goals and Plans

Make curricular recommendations in this section. This section must include a discussion of how assessment results are being used for program planning. Evaluate the intended learning outcomes of all the programs being reviewed, and revise if appropriate. Provide the rationale for any recommendations in light of the information collected and analyzed.

6. PROGRAM METRICS AND REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS

The Required Data Elements discussed in this section are attached in Appendix G of this report. Required Data Elements will be generated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics. Please contact the office at the beginning of the semester that you are starting your program plan to have these generated. Discussion should be reflected around degrees and concentrations as applicable and discussed below.

a. Enrollment, retention, overall GPA, and graduation rates

- Describe trends in first time freshmen and transfer enrollments. What efforts are made to recruit students? Describe the effectiveness of your process for student recruitment, including recruiting URM students (Underrepresented Minority).
- Report numbers for total, URM, and Non-URM populations for graduation (4-year and 6-year), retention, and overall GPA. In particular, any processes that you are using to retain and graduate URM students.
- Compare your numbers to college and university averages, and explain significant deviations, if any.
- Compare 4-year and 6-yr graduation rates for first-time freshmen to the current college and current university targets for total, URM and Non-URM populations. If you are below college or university levels, discuss strategies and how you plan to improve your graduation rates within the next program review.
b. **Headcount in sections**
   - Describe trends in average section size, and compare numbers to college and university averages. Explain significant deviations, if any.

c. **FTES and Induced Load Matrix**
   - Describe trends in program FTES and the Induced Load Matrix.
   - Discuss composition of FTES with respect to program majors, new students, and graduating students.
   - Discuss enrollment in minors, certificate programs, and service courses, if applicable.

d. **FTEF, SFR, Percentage T/TT Faculty**
   - Describe trends in FTEF and SFR in the program, and calculate the current percentage of tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty to total FTEF. Comment on tenure density within the department.
   - Explain any significant deviations from the college and university averages, if any.

e. **Faculty profile**
   - Summarize the profile (e.g., gender, rank, ethnicity) of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, noting the estimated schedule of expected retirements.
   - Summarize the profile (e.g., gender, number of years teaching at SJSU, ethnicity) of the full- and part-time lecturers contributing to the program(s), noting any recent trends.
   - Curriculum vitae for all faculty could be included in Appendix H (Optional).
   - Identify any issues that the profiles may present in the next five years.

7. **PROGRAM RESOURCES**

a. **Program Support**
   - Analyze the adequacy and effectiveness of the program's clerical support, technical support staff, and other instructional support.
   - Analyze the adequacy and effectiveness of the program's equipment and facilities.
   - Identify any external funding (contracts, grants, gifts, etc.) received by the program to support its instructional program.
   - Evaluate the adequacy of library holdings and related informational resources.

b. **Resource Management**
   - Describe the process for distribution/allocation of resources within the program(s) by degree and concentration as necessary.
   - Reflect on resource utilization in relation to level of instruction for the period under review (e.g., ratio of Part-time faculty to Full-time faculty, faculty teaching workload balance, etc.).
   - Prioritize any instructional support needs in order of importance to the program.

8. **Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA)**
   - Defined by Senate Policy S94-8 and Sense of the Senate SS-S11-5
   - Describe the current collective departmental scholarship/creative activities. Reflect upon the department’s performance in this area with regard to your own expectations, disciplines expectations, student success, and challenges with meeting those expectations. The nature of this
report will vary depending on discipline but might include items such as publications, books, conference presentations, grants, compositions, etc. If applicable, include how students are involved in departmental scholarship/creative activities as part of high-impact practices.

- Discuss departmental goals for RSCA over the range of the next program planning cycle and strategies to achieve them.
- Report all resources (including library and information resources) and/or infrastructure needed to support RSCA activities that are not currently available or functional.

9. OTHER STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND CHALLENGES

This section is optional. If there are other strengths and/or weaknesses of the program not captured previously, describe them here. They could include things such as:

- Number of High Impact Practices in curriculum
- Major gifts, donations, or endowed chairships
- Faculty, alumni, or student accomplishments not listed elsewhere
- Unique student compositions, backgrounds, or other contributions

10. DEPARTMENT ACTION PLAN

List action items or recommendations for future improvement of student learning, research, and program operations. Describe resources and timelines required for each. Please consider all categories of program review in this report in preparing your action plan.

11. APPENDICES TO SELF-STUDY

a. Annual Program Assessment summaries and evidence of direct assessment.
b. GE Package (Annual GE Assessment summaries and Programmatic GE Review)
c. Catalogue descriptions for each degree program
d. Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULG). Provide a Matrix of PLOs to Courses.
e. Assessment Data and Rubrics
f. Alumni Survey and data collected.
g. Required Data Elements
   - Exhibit 1 Four year and Six year Graduation Rates (URM, Non-URM, and total)
   - Exhibit 2 First and Third Year Retention Rates (URM, Non-URM, and total)
   - Exhibit 3 Achievement Gap (Graduating GPA of URM, Non-URM, and total)
   - Exhibit 4 Applied, Admitted, and Enrolled
   - Exhibit 5 Number of Course Sections and Average Headcount per Section
   - Exhibit 3 Student to Faculty Ratio
   - Exhibit 4 Induced Course Load Matrix
   - Exhibit 6 Enrollment by Class Level with FTES
   - Exhibit 7 Enrollment by Major and Concentration
   - Exhibit 8 Degrees Awarded
h. Accreditation Report (if applicable)
i. Curriculum Vitae of faculty (Optional)
j. Other (as determined by the program)
Accredited Programs

1. Accredited programs may choose to provide a self-study in the same format as non-accredited programs. If they choose this, they will follow the same guidelines above.

2. Accredited programs that do not choose a self-study as described above must prepare the following to be submitted:
   A. Title Page
   B. Table of Contents Page
   C. Executive Summary
      The executive summary should be limited to 3-5 pages in length. It should summarize succinctly the accreditation report and evaluation from the accrediting body.
   D. Any section described above for non-accredited programs that was not included in the accrediting report or inadequately addressed. Please refer to the descriptions above for details.
   E. The accreditation report and evaluation.
   F. Appendices

Appendix: External Reviewer Guidelines and Process

1. Role of External Reviewer

The reviewer’s role is to bring an informed and dispassionate view to the assessment of the plan as it is presented. Before visiting the campus, the reviewer should review the Program Plan submitted by the Department. Does the plan respond to the assessment materials included in the report? Does it flow reasonably out of the current condition of the program? Does it respond to the university "Statement of Curricular Priorities?" (Senate Policy S93-14) Does it recognize important trends in the discipline, both nationally and as they may be reflected in the metropolitan area served by San José State University? Do the planned activities related to faculty, students, and community lead to measurable outcomes for the program in the next five years? Does it address the educational needs of the diverse community of which SJSU is a part? Clearly, the faculty in the program hope they have achieved those objectives, but it is the reviewer’s privilege and responsibility to evaluate that achievement.

During the visit, the reviewer will meet with students, faculty, and administrators. An initial interview will be held on the first day with the Dean and AVP-GUP. At the end of the visit, the reviewer will be asked to present initial impressions and findings at an exit interview, which will include the dean, faculty from the department, AVP-GUP, representative from the provost office, the Director of Assessment, and representative from the Program Planning Committee.

2. External Reviewer Selection Criteria

The Department nominates at least three acceptable candidates for the external reviewer, who meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrated leader in the field (publications or creative works; reputation in instruction; active participation in appropriate scholarly and/or professional activities).
- Affiliation with accredited academic department or program or professional organization appropriate to program being reviewed.
● No conflict-of-interest (i.e., no graduate of program, recent employee, friend or relative of any member of the program, recent contractual arrangements with program).
● Familiarity with academic/professional goals of the departments as well as the nature of the program being reviewed (e.g., experience with similar programs, experience with graduates of program being reviewed).
● Willingness to accept budget constraints (see below).

The department should consult with the three candidates and confirm that they would be willing to serve as an external reviewer.

3. Budget

● Cost of air travel from outside California, not to exceed rates available from a University contracted travel agency.
● $1,000 honorarium out of which the reviewer is expected to pay all expenses (except for out of state airfare).
  ○ Honorarium is paid from GUP office.
● If the program wishes to offer additional funds, it may do so at its own expense.

4. Procedures

A. Department submits to the Dean the resumes of the three candidates who are acceptable to the department and able to serve within the required time period as agreed upon. Resumes should be submitted at the same time as the self-study. The Dean recommends the reviewers in rank order and provides all resumes to the AVP-GUP.
B. The AVP-GUP selects one reviewer from the three submitted candidates and notifies the department of the selection.
C. The department arranges for the date of the review and the site visits. The Office of GUP engages the reviewer and sends contract and other relevant documents (Self-Study of Program, Program Planning Guidelines, Rubric for Evaluation of Program, Curricular Priorities, and letter of invitation) to the reviewer. The Department then arranges the schedule of the visit, including the entrance and exit interviews, in consultation with the College, the Program Planning Committee Chair, the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, and Office of Research.
D. The Department contacts the reviewer one month prior to visit to see if they need anything else.
E. At the time of the visit, the Office of GUP transfers funds to the College. The department arranges for all payments of honoraria and airfare.
F. The reviewer must submit a final report to the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs within three weeks of the visit.

5. External Reviewer Visit

A. Time: One and a half days to two days for site visit.
B. People to interact with while on campus:
  ● Department faculty, staff, students, and Department Chair (Alumni if possible)
  ● College Dean and Associate Deans
  ● AVP of GUP
  ● AVP of Research
  ● Provost (Optional)
  ● Program Planning Committee Chair or designee
C. Required Meetings:

● Initial interview with the Dean and AVP-GUP.
● Exit meeting for Reviewer to present initial impressions, to which all interested persons are invited. The following people will be invited to the Exit meeting: representative of the Provost; AVP-GUP, college dean; department chair and faculty; PPC Chair or designee; University Director of Assessment; AVP for Research, and other relevant constituencies where appropriate.
● Any meetings established by the department.

6. Template for the Report

A written report should be submitted electronically to the Office of GUP within three weeks after the completion of the reviewer’s visit. The report should be 3-5 pages in length and should be guided by the rubric shown below. Findings should be based on evidence that is collected in response to the primary focal points of the Self-Study. It must also include recommendations for change if the reviewer’s evaluation finds that the plan is inadequate in the light of assessment responses or other reasons that are explained. If possible, it should also include comparisons with other programs in institutions and communities that are similar to SJSU. The format of the report should be as follows:

a. Title Page with Table of Contents
b. Executive Summary
c. Process Overview (e.g., who performed review, with whom the reviewer(s) met on campus, dates of review, requested and provided documentation, etc.)
d. Department Program(s) and Curricula (e.g., program descriptions, student learning outcomes, assessment, bottlenecks to degree [if any], service learning, etc.)
e. Students (e.g., majors, minors, GE, certificate enrollments, issues, etc.)
f. Faculty (e.g., tenure/tenure-track vs. non-tenure/tenure-track, diversity, need for hires, etc.)
g. Resources (e.g., classroom, student, faculty, program support, etc.)
h. Summary and Recommendations
## External Reviewer Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Review</td>
<td>Curriculum is appropriate for its respective degree</td>
<td>Curriculum is appropriate for its respective degree, and is designed to facilitate timely completion</td>
<td>Curriculum is appropriate for its respective degree, is designed to facilitate timely completion, and/or provides adequate opportunities for students to meet expected outcomes.</td>
<td>Curriculum is appropriate for its respective degree, is designed to facilitate timely completion, and provides adequate opportunities for students to meet expected outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience</td>
<td>Student-faculty engagement is encouraged</td>
<td>Student-faculty engagement is encouraged; students are somewhat satisfied with the quality of advising, academic support, information resources, technology, internships, research, opportunities, etc.</td>
<td>Student-faculty engagement is encouraged; students are satisfied with the quality of advising, academic support, information resources, technology, internships, research, opportunities, etc.</td>
<td>Student-faculty engagement is encouraged; students are highly satisfied with the quality of advising, academic support, information resources, technology, internships, research, opportunities, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Planning and Management</td>
<td>Program realistically prioritizes needs based on its mission, learning goals, research, and overall direction.</td>
<td>Program realistically prioritizes needs based on its mission, learning goals, research, and overall direction, and appropriately articulates needs to Dean.</td>
<td>Program realistically prioritizes needs based on its mission, learning goals, research, and overall direction, adequately and appropriately articulates needs to Dean.</td>
<td>Program realistically prioritizes needs based on its mission, learning goals, research, and overall direction, adequately and appropriately articulates needs to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Program Achievement</td>
<td>Outcomes are based on knowledge, skills, and values relevant to the discipline.</td>
<td>Outcomes are based on knowledge, skills, and values relevant to the discipline, and are regularly assessed.</td>
<td>Outcomes are based on knowledge, skills, and values relevant to the discipline, are regularly and systematically assessed and reported.</td>
<td>Outcomes are based on knowledge, skills, and values relevant to the discipline, are regularly and systematically assessed, reported, followed up on, and integrated into departmental planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean, and/or makes efficient and effective use of available resources**

**Dean, and makes efficient and effective use of available resources**