



UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE

Educational Effectiveness Committee

Evaluation of Program Reviews:

Lessons Learned

May 31, 2011

Report prepared by:
Aghop Der-Karabetian
Associate VP for Assessment

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Purpose	5
3. Methods and Procedures	5
4. Findings	7
5. Debriefing Notes	8
6. Lessons Learned	10
Appendix A: List of program review documents	12
Appendix B: Rubrics for academic program reviews	16
Appendix C: Rubrics for administrative program reviews	19
Appendix D: Rubrics for evaluating action updates	22
Appendix E: Individual and master rating sheets	24
Appendix F: Feedback form to the program	29

Executive Summary

Purpose

The purpose of evaluating program reviews was to assess the quality of the program reviews of academic and administrative units, as well as assess the evaluation process itself.

Methods and Procedures

The program reviews selected for evaluation were the 20 completed between 2008 and 2011. There were 12 academic programs, 2 general education programs, and 6 administrative units. In addition to the program review documents 12 action updates were evaluated. External reviewer reports were available but were not evaluated.

The evaluators were 14 members of the EEC composed of faculty representing the colleges (Except COL) and administrative resource individuals. Seven paired teams were identified with one faculty and one administrative resource person whenever possible. Each team was assigned programs they were not affiliated with.

Separate evaluation rubrics were developed for the academic and the administrative programs reviews, and for the evaluation of Action Updates. Four-point rating scales were used with 4 = Accomplished, 3 = Developed, 2 = developing, and 1 = Undeveloped. The categories evaluated by the rubrics matched the outlines suggested in the program review guidelines. The rubric for the evaluation of the Action Updates had one category: Effective improvements, and used the same 4-point rating scale as the program review rubrics.

After a norming session, each of the two evaluation team members read the program review and the action update documents independently on-line, and rated the rubric categories on separate rating sheets, then they reached a consensus, and recorded their consent scores on a master data sheet. They also made commendations and recommendations for improvement on a separate feedback sheet.

Findings

The findings suggest that overall in about half the program review documents the various categories meet the accomplished and developed criteria. About one-in-three of the action updates reflect effective improvements, which is quite good, given that the program reviews evaluated were fairly recent ones (Since 2008), and that action recommendations are expected to be addressed through a five-year effort, corresponding to the five-year cycle of program reviews.

The following common themes are present in the recommendations for improvement:

- a. Need to show better and more explicit connections between learning outcomes/goals and assessment methods

- b. State learning outcomes in measurable terms
- c. Align action recommendations with the findings more directly
- d. Data presentations, tables, and appendices could be better labeled and referenced
- e. Make better use of the guidelines and templates for consistency
- f. Action updates should reflect priorities, and provide better rationale for inaction or delays

Highlights of Lessons Learned

The following are the salient lessons learned:

1. The process of using two raters who are unaffiliated with the program review being evaluated works well. Need to provide an arbiter and a program expert in case they are needed.
2. Accessing the documents on-line made it possible for both raters to read the same document at the same time. However, some on-line document did not include electronic versions of appendices because of being too massive.
3. The time it takes to evaluate the program review documents and action updates takes about 45 minutes to an hour, which was thought to be very reasonable.
4. The external reviewer report is best evaluated when considered as an “assessment tool” rather than as an independent document.
5. The global rubrics and the evaluation criteria need minor adjustments, but are sensitive enough to provide good variability in ratings of various categories and elements of the program review.
6. A detailed checklist of specific elements to look for while evaluating a particular category are helpful in utilizing the global rubrics. Consider rating each of the specific elements in the checklist to help with providing more detailed feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of the program review.
7. Revise the program review guidelines to highlight in more detail aspect or elements of data and reporting format that seem to be lacking in content, rigor or clarity.
8. Emphasize in the guidelines the need to better align learning outcomes, assessment methods, findings and action recommendations. A matrix template may be helpful to demonstrate such alignment.
9. Expect more diligence in following the guidelines and the templates to provide better consistency.
10. Attach the rubrics and the detailed checklists to the guidelines to underscore what is expected of a quality review.

Evaluation of Program Reviews

Purpose

The purpose of evaluating program reviews was to assess the quality of the program reviews of academic and administrative units, as well as assess the evaluation process itself.

Methods and Procedures

Documents

The program reviews selected for evaluation were the 20 completed between 2008 and 2011. There were 12 academic programs, 2 general education programs, and 6 administrative units. In addition to the program review documents 12 action updates were evaluated. If there was more than one action update document the most recent one was used for evaluation, and the previous ones were available for inspection. These documents were accessed from the Institutional Research [webpage](#) by the laptops of the evaluators. Hard copies were available too. Nine external review reports were also available for evaluation with corresponding rubrics. However, the EEC (Educational Effectiveness Committee) evaluating team decided not to evaluate these document at this time. See [Appendix A](#) for complete list of documents.

Evaluators

The evaluators were 14 members of the EEC composed of faculty representing the colleges (Except COL) and administrative resource individuals. Seven paired teams were identified with one faculty and one administrative resource person whenever possible. Each team was assigned programs they were not affiliated with.

Rubrics

Separate evaluation rubrics were developed for the academic and the administrative programs reviews, and for the evaluation of Action Updates. Four-point rating scales were used with 4 = Accomplished, 3 = Developed, 2 = developing, and 1 = Undeveloped.

The categories evaluated by the rubrics matched the outlines suggested in the program review guidelines. They were as follows for the academic programs ([Appendix B](#)):

- a. Executive summary
- b. Learning outcomes and program goals
- c. Capacity and program description
- d. Assessment procedures of learning outcomes
- e. Findings
- f. Action recommendations
- g. Appendices

The categories evaluated by the rubrics were as follows for the administrative units ([Appendix C](#)):

- a. Executive summary
- b. Goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes
- c. Capacity and program description
- d. Indicators and assessment procedures
- e. Findings
- f. Action recommendations
- g. Appendices

The rubric for the evaluation of the Action Updates had one category: Effective improvements, and used the same 4-point rating scale as the program review rubrics ([Appendix D](#)).

A checklist of elements to attend to under each category accompanied all three rubrics.

Procedures

EEC evaluators spent one complete day to conduct the evaluation of program reviews.

A norming exercise was conducted as a group with everyone reading the same program review and action update documents (Theatre - completed before 2007) and using the rubrics for evaluation. Discussion followed clarifying the use of the rubrics and interpretation of the language used in the rubrics. Consensus emerged regarding the evaluation of the norming sample documents.

Each of the two evaluation team members read the program review and the action update documents independently on-line, and rated the rubric categories on separate rating sheets. They were given note sheets to write comments and observation as they read and

evaluated the documents for use in discussions with their team members. After reading and rating the documents, the team members came together to compare their ratings, and reached a consensus if there were discrepancies. The consensus scores were transferred to a master data sheet with appropriate identification of the program. If they could not reach consensus with one point discrepancy the mean rating was recorded. If consensus was not reached with more than one point discrepancy, a third person would read and rate the document and rate it and try to reach consensus (Such and intervention was not needed). See [Appendix E](#) for the individual and the master rating sheets.

After recording their consent scores on the master sheet they wrote down commendations and recommendations for improvement on a feedback form addressed to the program for future use ([Appendix F](#)).

Findings

Table 1 summarizes the ratings across 20 program reviews evaluated by the EEC and the overall effectiveness of action updates. Academic programs, administrative programs, and General Education competencies were combined.

The findings suggest that overall in about half the program review documents the various categories meet the accomplished and developed criteria. About one-in-three of the action updates reflect effective improvements, which is quite good, given that the program reviews evaluated were fairly recent ones (Since 2008), and that action recommendations are expected to be addressed through a five-year effort, corresponding to the five-year cycle of program reviews.

Table 1: Mean ratings (4-point scale) and percentages of Accomplished and Developed categories of program reviews and action updates

Program Review Documents (N = 20)	Mean	Accomplished/Developed Ratings 3 & 4
1. Executive Summary	2.7	65%
2. Learning Outcomes/Objectives/Goals	2.5	50%
3. Capacity and Program Description	2.3	40%
3. Assessment Procedures	2.7	50%
4. Findings	2.4	45%

5. Action recommendations	2.2	40%
6. Appendices	2.9	60%
Action Updates (N = 12)		
Effectiveness and Improvement	2.3	33%

The findings also suggest that there is room for improvement in conducting and presenting various aspects of the program reviews. The written recommendations in the feedback forms to the departments identify specific ways of improving the process and the presentation of information in the document. Given the initial exploratory nature of this evaluation effort, the EEC members who participated in the process left sharing of the recommendations in the departmental feedback form to the discretion of the AVP for Assessment. The following common themes are present in the recommendations for improvement:

- a. Need to show better and more explicit connections between learning outcomes/goals and assessment methods
- b. State learning outcomes in measurable terms
- c. Align action recommendations with the findings more directly
- d. Data presentations, tables, and appendices could be better labeled and referenced
- e. Make better use of the guidelines and templates for consistency
- f. Action updates should reflect priorities, and provide better rationale for inaction or delays

Debriefing Notes

At the conclusion of the day a debriefing session was held to share process issues and lessons learned with recommendations for improving the documents and the guidelines. These observations will lead to modifications in the rubrics, revision of instructions in the program review guidelines, and improvements in the process of evaluating program reviews in the future. The following summarizes the discussion points and recommendations expressed during the debriefing session:

Process

1. Having two people evaluate the documents who were not affiliate with the program being reviewed was very good.
2. It would help to have a program expert or someone familiar with the program available for reference and consultation.

3. Provide a third person as an arbiter if consensus is not reached by the two evaluators - when there is more than one point discrepancy on the rating of a rubric category.

Rubrics

1. The checklist of elements to look for in the review document that accompanied the global rubric was very helpful.
2. Having 4-point ratings for each of the checklist elements may provide a more detailed feedback to the program, in addition to the global rubric ratings, and help the discussion to reach consensus.
3. The rubrics based on the guidelines captured different elements of the reports well, and provided language for feedback.
4. Include in the rubrics an assessment of the Mission/Vision and its relationship to the University's Mission and Vision, and how well the learning outcomes, goals and objectives reflect the program Mission/Vision.

Program Review Guidelines

1. Attach the rubrics and the checklists of elements to the guidelines of the program review, the external reviewer, and the action updates.
2. Highlight in the program review guidelines the need to:
 - a. Include a balance of tables and narratives in the section on findings as appropriate. All tables need a narrative reference
 - b. Refer to learning outcomes, goals, and objectives throughout the review document, and the action updates by numbers as well as state what they are.
 - c. Be objective rather than merely "make a case" for resources.
 - d. Connect data to learning outcomes, goals and objectives.
 - e. Connect assessment methods explicitly to student learning outcomes and goals.
3. Not all reports follow the same outline, even though the guidelines suggest an outline.
4. Make it clear that appendices include detailed data and information that add value are referenced in the text. Appendices may be hyperlinked in the text for easy reference.

Action Recommendations and Action Updates

1. Create an action recommendation template to include
 - a. Data sources
 - b. Action plan timelines
2. Revise the rubric for Action Updates to include two separate criteria that reflect:

- a. “Honest effort” in what was done
- b. Effectiveness-seriousness of the effort to make improvements

External Review

1. Place External Review reports in the appendix in entirety.
2. The external review may be seen as a data source and described under assessment methods/procedures, and included under findings.
3. Identify the qualification of the external reviewer(s) under assessment methods/procedures.

Provide Feedback

1. AVP for Assessment may provide feedback to the programs with discretion through deans and assessment coordinators regarding the findings of the present evaluation efforts.
2. EEC members may serve in supportive/consultative roles to program reviews in colleges.
3. Identify common elements that need improvements and share with deans.

Question to explore further

1. Should EEC evaluate administrative reviews?

Lessons Learned

This exercise of evaluating program reviews helped determine the effectiveness of the process, and establish the adequacy of the rating tools and rubrics. It also provided an opportunity to assess the quality of program reviews, and the way they are documented.

The following are the salient lessons learned:

1. The process of using two raters who are unaffiliated with the program review being evaluated works well. Need to provide an arbiter and a program expert in case they are needed.
2. Accessing the documents on-line made it possible for both raters to read the same document at the same time. However, some on-line documents did not include electronic versions of appendices because of being too massive.
3. The time it takes to evaluate the program review documents and action updates takes about 45 minutes to an hour, which was thought to be very reasonable.
4. The external reviewer report is best evaluated when considered as an “assessment tool” rather than as an independent document.

5. The global rubrics and the evaluation criteria need minor adjustments, but are sensitive enough to provide good variability in ratings of various categories and elements of the program review.
6. A detailed checklist of specific elements to look for while evaluating a particular category are helpful in utilizing the global rubrics. Consider rating each of the specific elements in the checklist to help with providing more detailed feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of the program review.
7. Revise the program review guidelines to highlight in more detail aspect or elements of data and reporting format that seem to be lacking in content, rigor or clarity.
8. Emphasize in the guidelines the need to better align learning outcomes, assessment methods, findings and action recommendations.
9. Expect more diligence in following the guidelines and the templates to provide better consistency.
10. Attach the rubrics and the detailed checklists to the guidelines to underscore what is expected of a quality review.

Appendix A

List of Program Review Documents

**List of Program Review Documents
For Review by
Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC)
5-26-2011**

College of Art and Science History of program Reviews

1. Chemistry

- * Program Review 2009
- * External Review 2010

2. ESL

- * Program Review 2011

3. International Business and Language

- * Program Review 2008
- * Action Update 2009 & 2010

4. International Studies

- * Program Review 2009
- * Action Update 2010

5. Liberal Arts

- * Program Review 2009
- * External Review 2009
- * Action Update 2010

6. Mathematics

- * Program Review 2009
- * External Review 2011
- * Action Update 2008 & 2010

7. MFT

- * Program Review 2008
- * External Review 2010
- * Action Update 2009 & 2010
- * Action Update 2010

8. Organization Leadership, EdD
* Program Review 2010

9. Physics
* Program Review 2009
* Action Update 2010

10. Psychology-Undergraduate
* Program Review 2008
* Action Update 2009

11. Social Science
* Program Review 2008

12. Writing
* Program Review 2008
* External Review 2009
* Action Update 2009 & 2010

General Education

1. Community Service
* Program Review 2010
* Action Update 2011

2. Humanities
* Program Review 2010
* Action Update 2011

Administrative and Service Program History of program Review

1. Center for teaching and learning
* Program Review 2010
* External Review 2010
* Action Update 2011

2. Learning Enhancement Center

- * Program Review 2010
- * External Review 2010
- * Action Update 2011

3. Wilson Library

- * Program Review 2009
- * Action Update 2011

4. Office Information Technology

- * Program Review 2010
- * External Review 2010
- * Action Update 2011

5. Multicultural Services and First Generation Program

- * Program Review 2010
- * External Review 2011

6. Annual Giving

- * Program Review 2010

Appendix B

Rubric for Academic Program Reviews

Categories	Accomplished 4	Developed 3	Developing 2	Undeveloped 1
A. Executive Summary	Very well organized with a flowing narrative that identifies all learning outcomes, highlights program's salient characteristics and capacity, briefly describes all the assessment procedures, summarizes major the findings identifying deficits, and lists all the action recommendations tied to the findings in order of priority	Organized well using a narrative that mentions learning outcomes, identifies some program characteristics and capacity, briefly highlights most of the assessment procedures, summarizes the major findings, and identifies most of the action recommendations tied to the findings without priority	Uses a narrative that mentions several learning outcomes and few program characteristics, highlights only some of the assessment procedures in general term, mentions some of the findings without specifics , and identifies few of the action recommendations with unclear ties to findings	Not well organized, perhaps using bullets, skips around and misses significant elements of the review, does not mention specific assessment procedures or findings, and recommendations sound like a wish list with unclear ties to findings
B. Learning Outcomes and Program Goals	All outcomes and goals are specific , phrased using action words in measurable terms, and include several institution-wide (University Values/critical skills) learning outcomes	All outcomes and goals are fairly specific, are phrased using action words with some exceptions , are stated in measurable terms, and include at least one institution-wide learning outcome	Most outcomes and goals are fairly specific, but few are phrased using action words , few are stated in measurable terms, and do not include institution-wide learning outcomes	Most outcomes and goals are stated in general terms lacking specifics , are phrased using non-action words , few are stated in measurable terms, and do not include institution-wide learning outcomes
C. Capacity and Program Description	Program's capacity is very well described and documented with evidence , identifies the roles and qualifications of full-time and adjunct faculty, tracks enrollment patterns, majors, graduates and FTE students served, describes and evaluates the advising, scheduling and rotation of courses, demonstrates the alignment of learning outcomes with courses (curriculum map), and describes and evaluates the resources and facilities	Program's capacity is adequately described and documented with evidence , identifies the roles and qualifications of full-time faculty and mentions use of adjunct faculty, tracks enrollment patterns, majors, graduates and FTE students served, describes and evaluates the advising, scheduling and rotation of courses, demonstrates the alignment of learning outcomes with courses (curriculum map), and merely describes the resources and facilities	Program's capacity is adequately described but lacks documentation , identifies the roles and qualifications of full-time faculty and does not mentions use of adjunct faculty, tracks no more than one student trend such as enrollment patterns of majors, graduates and FTE students served, describes the advising , scheduling and rotation of courses, mentions but does not demonstrates the alignment of learning outcomes with courses (curriculum map), and merely mentions the adequacy or lack of resources and facilities	Program's capacity is inadequately described and lacks documentation , identifies full-time faculty without qualifications and does not mention use of adjunct faculty, does not tracks student trends , does not describes the advising, scheduling and rotation of courses, does not demonstrates the alignment of learning outcomes with the curriculum, and merely mentions the adequacy or lack of resources and facilities
D. Assessment Procedures of Learning outcomes	Several direct performance measures of learning outcomes are used, senior and alumni surveys that address all	At least one direct performance measure of learning outcomes is used, senior and alumni surveys that address	No direct performance measure of learning outcomes is used, senior and alumni surveys that address most of the learning	No direct performance measure of learning outcomes is used, senior and alumni surveys that address few of the learning

	learning outcomes and capacity issues are administered, as well as input from stakeholders other than students are obtained using objective and/or qualitative measures	all learning outcomes and capacity issues are administered, as well as input from stakeholders other than students are obtained using objective or qualitative measures	outcomes with minimal reference to capacity issues are administered, input from stakeholders other than students are obtained anecdotally	outcomes with no reference to capacity issues are administered, input from stakeholders other than students are not obtained
E. Findings	Data are presented in easy to read format (Tables and graphs and narrative that explicitly and systematically address each of the learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each learning outcome is correctly inferred from the data , and all areas of deficit that need improvement are clearly and explicitly identified	Data are presented in easy to read format (Tables and graphs) and narrative that address each of the learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each learning outcome is correctly inferred from the data , and areas of deficit that need improvement are identified in general terms	Data are presented in tables and graphs with minimal narrative , and superficially address each of the learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each learning outcome is mentioned in general terms , and areas of deficit that need improvement are identified in general terms	Data are presented in tables and graphs with almost no narrative , and fails to relate the findings specifically to the learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each learning outcome is mentioned in general terms , and areas of deficit that need improvement are not mentioned
F. Action Recommendations	All recommendations are evidence based , and areas of deficit in student learning outcomes, curriculum, resources and functions are targeted for improvement with accompanying action plans with timelines	All recommendations are evidence based , and areas of deficit in student learning outcomes, curriculum, resources and functions are targeted for improvement with action plans to be developed or not mentioned	Most recommendations are evidence based , but several sound like wishes not supported by evidence, and several areas of deficit in student learning outcomes are not targeted for improvement	Most recommendations are not evidence based and sound like a wish list for resources , and most areas of deficit in student learning outcomes are not targeted for improvement
G. Appendices	All appendices are labeled clearly , add value to the text and are appropriately referred to in the text	All appendices are labeled clearly and are appropriately referred to in the text	Most appendices are labeled clearly but not all are appropriately referred to in the text	Appendices are not labeled , seem like an afterthought , and most are not referred to in the text

Appendix C

Rubric for Administrative Program Reviews

Categories	Accomplished 4	Developed 3	Developing 2	Undeveloped 1
A. Executive Summary	Very well organized with a flowing narrative that identifies all goals and objectives, highlights program's salient characteristics and capacity, briefly describes all the indicators and assessment procedures, summarizes major findings identifying deficits, and lists all the action recommendations tied to the findings in order of priority	Organized well using a narrative that mentions most goals and objectives, identifies some program characteristics and capacity, briefly highlights most of the indicators or assessment procedures, summarizes the major findings, and identifies most of the action recommendations tied to the findings without priority	Uses a narrative that mentions several goals and objectives and few program characteristics, highlights only some of the indicators or assessment procedures in general term, mentions some of the findings without specifics , and identifies few of the action recommendations with unclear ties to findings	Not well organized, perhaps using bullets, skips around and misses significant elements of the review, does not mention specific assessment procedures or findings, and recommendations sound like a wish list with unclear ties to findings
B. Goals, Objectives and/or Learning Outcomes	All goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes are specific , phrased using action words in measurable terms, and include stakeholder satisfaction	All goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes are fairly specific, are phrased using action words with some exceptions , are stated in measurable terms, and include stakeholder satisfaction	Most goals are fairly specific, but few are phrased using action words , few are stated in measurable terms, and do not include stakeholder satisfaction	Most goals are stated in general terms lacking specifics , are phrased using non-action words , few are stated in measurable terms, and do not include stakeholder satisfaction
C. Capacity and Program Description	Program's capacity is very well described and documented with evidence , identifies staffing and personnel with an organizational chart and turnover issues, describes and evaluates the resources and facilities, and trends the budget	Program's capacity is adequately described and documented with evidence , identifies staffing and personnel with an organizational chart and turnover issues, and merely describes the resources and facilities, and trends the budget	Program's capacity is adequately described but lacks documentation , identifies staffing without an organizational chart and merely mentions the adequacy or lack of resources and facilities, and provides the last budget without trending	Program's capacity is inadequately described and lacks documentation , mentions adequacy or lack of staffing, and merely mentions the adequacy or lack of resources and facilities
D. Indicators and Assessment Procedures	Several direct and indirect performance measures or indicators are used, address all goals and objectives, and input from external and internal stakeholders are obtained with surveys and/or focus groups	At least one direct and one indirect performance measure or indicator is used, address all goals and objectives, and input from external stakeholders are obtained with surveys and/or focus groups	No direct performance measures or indicators are used, and input from stakeholders are obtained anecdotally	No direct performance measures or indicators are used, and input from stakeholders are not obtained

E. Findings	Data are presented in easy to read format (Tables and graphs) and narrative that explicitly and systematically address each of the goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each is correctly inferred from the data , and all areas of strengths as well as deficits that need improvement are clearly and explicitly identified	Data are presented in easy to read format (Tables and graphs) and narrative that address each of the goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each is correctly inferred from the data , and areas of deficit that need improvement are identified in general terms	Data are presented in tables and graphs with minimal narrative , and superficially address each of the goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each is mentioned in general terms , and areas of deficit that need improvement are identified in general terms	Data are presented in tables and graphs with almost no narrative , and fails to relate the findings specifically to the goals, objectives and/or learning outcomes, degree of attainment of each learning outcome is mentioned in general terms , and areas of deficit that need improvement are not mentioned
F. Action Recommendations	All recommendations are evidence based , and areas of deficit in resources and functions are targeted for improvement with accompanying action plans with timelines	All recommendations are evidence based , and areas of deficit in resources and functions are targeted for improvement with action plans to be developed or not mentioned	Most recommendations are evidence based , but several sound like wishes not supported by evidence, and several areas of deficit are not targeted for improvement	Most recommendations are not evidence based and sound like a wish list for resources , and most areas of deficit are not targeted for improvement
G. Appendices	All appendices are labeled clearly , add value to the text and are appropriately referred to in the text	All appendices are labeled clearly and are appropriately referred to in the text	Most appendices are labeled clearly but not all are appropriately referred to in the text	Appendices are not labeled , seem like an afterthought , and most are not referred to in the text

Appendix D

Rubric for Evaluation Action Updates

University of La Verne
Action Update Evaluation
 Rubric

Action Update	4 Accomplished	3 Developed	2 Developing	1 Undeveloped
Effective Improvements	Lists all recommendations and provides action information with explanations when appropriate reflecting serious effort by the program and the senior manager (multi-year, if appropriate) to improve the program in a timely fashion , addressing resource needs as well as structural or functional improvements	Lists all recommendations and provides action information with some explanation reflecting effort (Multi-year, if appropriate) to improve the program, addressing resource needs as well as structural or functional improvements	Lists recommendations and provides action information reflecting somewhat delayed actions citing lack of resources/time to improve the program, and addressing primarily resource needs	Lists recommendations and provides minimal action information with no explanations reflecting delayed actions citing lack of resources/time to improve the program, addressing primarily resource needs

Checklist

1. List of all action recommendations
2. Actions stated with explanations when appropriate
3. Reflects serious effort by program and senior manager
4. Timeliness of the actions
5. Address resource needs as well as functional/organizational improvements
6. Multi-year follow through, if appropriate

Appendix E

Individual and Master Rating Sheets

**Program Review Evaluation
DATA SHEET
Individual Evaluator**

Name of Program: _____

Name of Evaluator: _____

Program Review Document

Date of Program Review: _____

	<u>Rubric Rating</u>			
1. Executive Summary Comments:	4	3	2	1
2. Learning Outcomes/objectives and Goals Comments:	4	3	2	1
3. Capacity and program Description Comments:	4	3	2	1
4. Assessment Procedures of Learning Outcomes Comments:	4	3	2	1
5. Findings Comments	4	3	2	1
6. Action Recommendations Comments:	4	3	2	1
7. Appendices Comments:	4	3	2	1

External Review Document

Date of External Review: _____

1. Process Comments:	4	3	2	1
-------------------------	---	---	---	---

2. Issues Addressed Comments:	4	3	2	1
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---

3. Recommendations Comments:	4	3	2	1
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---

Action Updates

Effectiveness of improvements Comments:	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---

Additional Comments and Suggestions for Improvement

**Program Review Evaluation
MASTER DATA SHEET**

Name of Program: _____

Program Review Document

Date of Program Review: _____

	<u>Rubric Rating</u>			
1. Executive Summary Comments:	4	3	2	1
2. Learning Outcomes/objectives and Goals Comments:	4	3	2	1
3. Capacity and program Description Comments:	4	3	2	1
4. Assessment Procedures of Learning Outcomes Comments:	4	3	2	1
5. Findings Comments	4	3	2	1
6. Action Recommendations Comments:	4	3	2	1
7. Appendices Comments:	4	3	2	1

External Review Document

Date of External Review: _____

1. Process Comments:	4	3	2	1
-------------------------	---	---	---	---

2. Issues Addressed Comments:	4	3	2	1
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---

3. Recommendations Comments:	4	3	2	1
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---

Action Updates

Effectiveness of improvements Comments:	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---

Additional Comments and Suggestions for Improvement

Appendix F

Feedback Form to the Program

Program Review Evaluation
Educational Effectiveness Committee

FEEDBACK FORM

TO
PROGRAM

Name of Program: _____

Date: _____

Program review

A. Commendations:

B. Recommendations for Improvement:

External Review

A. Commendations:

B. Recommendations for Improvement:

Action Updates

A. Commendations:

B. Recommendations for Improvement: