Educational Effectiveness Committee

Program Review Evaluations

Feedback to Departments and Programs

Updated: 11/9/12

College of Arts and Sciences

Name & Year Of Review	Date and Mean Evaluation (4-point scale, 4=Accomplished, across 7 dimensions—See footnote)	Commendations	Recommendations
Biology 2012	10/18/12 Mean = 2.43	1. Executive summary was addressed the main points 2. The review document was well written 3. Good deal of data and helpful information was provided 4. Capacity and program description had good detailed data 5. Good use of direct and indirect measures of learning outcomes	1. Some of the learning outcomes are stated in more measurable terms than others 2. Make more explicit linkages between the assessment methods, learning outcomes, findings, and recommendations could be more direct than implied 3. Appendices could be better referenced in the text
Chemistry 2009	5/31/11 Mean = 2.43	1. Excellent program that produces skilled and knowledgeable graduates	1. State learning outcomes in measurable terms 2. Base capacity recommendations on data 3. Include a curriculum map and course rotation schedule 4. Base findings and recommendations better on data 5. Clearly label appendices

Computer Science 2012	10/18/12 Mean = 2.43	1. Executive summary was easy to follow; could have include highlight of findings better 2. Helpful data tables with good information on faculty qualifications, courses, etc. 3. Capacity and program description was well done	1. Create a set of learning outcomes that are industry or area specific and can be sued as basis for instruction and assessment; the ones listed could apply to any program 2. Develop rubrics that are based on new learning outcomes that help refine the outcomes for competency and clarity 3. Could describe capstone projects more clearly 4. Align exit survey question more closely with learning outcomes 5. Summarize data based on outcomes 6. Recommendations could be tied better to findings and learning outcomes 7. Some data charts could be better in Appendices
English 2011	12/1/11 Mean = 1.93	1. Learning outcomes are well outlined and specific 2. Learning outcomes include several Mission values	1. Include executive summary 2. Clarify type of measures and performance indicators 3. Support recommendations better with data 4. Seek more alumni input 5. Address each learning outcome explicitly
English as a Second Language (ESL)-Modern Languages Department) 2011	5/31/11 Mean = 3.14	1. Informative Executive Summary 2. Well articulated learning outcomes	1. Refer appendices in the narrative text 2. Connect recommendations more explicitly to findings
International Business and Language 2008	5/31/11 Mean = 2.28	1. Well written narrative 2. Good organization	1. Restate learning outcomes in the assessment and finding areas 2. Provide more specific information while describing the program 3. Emphasize direct measures of student learning outcomes.

International Studies 2009	5/31/11 Mean = 1.43	1. Good appendices	1. Include Executive Summary 2. Identify learning outcomes clearly 3. Provide more complete description of faculty and resources 4. Link assessments to learning outcomes more directly 5. Support recommendations with findings
History and Political Science 2012	10/18/12 Mean = 2.43	1. Good summary overall 2. Capacity and program description is well developed 3. Very good evaluation of student and alumni feedback 4. Appendices are well organized and presented	1. Learning outcomes may be stated in more measurable terms 2. Charts in the capacity and program description sections could be clearer and better utilized to address issues 3. Learning outcomes data are limited to exit surveys and senior projects; could use other direct measures 4. In the findings section the data synthesis of the data are limited 5. Need to have stronger and more direct link between findings and action recommendations 6. The value and purpose of some of the appendices were unclear; could be tied to the narrative better
Mathematics 2009	5/31/11 Mean = 3.29	1. Well organized 2. Well written 3. Well-referenced appendices	1. Include findings and recommendations in Executive summary 2. Include the curriculum map in the program description 3. Include alumni survey/input in assessment methods 4. Connect recommendations to findings more explicitly
Marriage Family Therapy (MFT) 2008	5/31/11 Mean = 3.71	1. Detailed with rich and cross referenced data 2. Well written and easily read narrative	1. Separate program goals from learning objectives 2. Connect measures to outcomes more directly 3. Stronger focus on student-centered recommendations 4. Connect faculty requests to data

Movement and Sports Science 2012	10/18/12

Mean = 3.29 | 1. Learning outcomes are clearly stated
2. Capacity and program description were well developed
3. Appendices were well organized | 1. Need to use direct measures of student learning outcomes in addition to self-report, such as senior projects, internship evaluations by supervisors, exit exams, etc.
2. Alumni survey had few responses and yet was used extensively; graduating seniors can be surveyed on an ongoing bases before they leave.
3. Diversity plan could be better developed. |
| Liberal Arts 2009 | 5/31/11

Mean = 1.43 | 1. Good survey | 1. Develop better learning outcomes
2. Use direct measures of student performance
3. Connect learning outcomes to assessments
4. State findings more specifically and avoid over-generalizations
5. Connect recommendations to data |
| Physics 2008 | 5/31/11

Mean = 2.71 | 1. Good progress update from previous program review
2. Well written and organized
3. Good data summaries | 1. State learning outcome in measurable terms using action words
2. Present learning outcomes better in curriculum map
3. Improve labeling of tables
4. Connect recommendations more directly to findings |
| Psychology-Undergraduate 2008 | 5/31/11

Mean = 2.21 | 1. Well written Executive Summary
2. Helpful Appendices | 1. State learning outcomes in measurable terms
2. Align learning outcomes with curriculum—need curriculum map
3. Obtain alumni input
4. Address each learning outcome separately in findings
5. Connect recommendations to findings
6. Clarify and organize tables better |
| Religion and Philosophy 2011 | 2/2/12

Mean = 2.00 | 1. Good description of faculty and capacity issues
2. Well documented Appendices; add value but not in all instances | 1. No executive summary-looked like a general profile
2. Phrase learning outcomes in actionable terms
3. Assessment procedures should include aggregated direct performance indicators
4. Provide direct performance data in the findings section
5. Action recommendations should be focused more student learning |

Social Science 2009	5/31/11 Mean = 1.71	1. Well thought out	1. Followed guidelines better 2. State learning outcomes in measurable terms 3. Clarify roles of part-time and full-time faculty 4. Clarify description of interdisciplinary nature of the program 5. Use direct measures of student performance such as senior projects or waiver exams 6. Base action recommendations on data
Writing 2008	5/31/11 Mean = 1.71	1. Good appendices but unlinked to text	1. Develop learning outcome in specific measurable terms 2. Follow the program review guidelines 3. Link better learning outcomes to assessments and recommendations 4. Link appendices to narrative 5. Include curriculum map

College of Business and Public Management

BS in Organizational Management (BSOM) 2011	12/1/11 Mean = 2.00	1. Student and alumni surveys are well done 2. Course embedded assessment of learning outcomes are well developed 3. Learning outcomes are clearly articulated	1. Provide evidence regarding capacity issues 2. Refer to and describe the assessment rubric in the text 3. Connect findings better to the assessment information 4. Make more explicit the connections between findings and recommendations
Masters in Business Administration (MBA) 2011	12/1/11 Mean = 3.14	1. Learning outcomes, assessment and findings are well connected 2. Program capacity is well documented 3. Appendices are well done and helpful	1. Connect action recommendations more directly with evidence 2. Support recommendation of new program with evidence 3. Provide a curriculum map 4. Edit for spelling and neatness

MS Leadership Management (MSLM) 2011	12/1/11 Mean = 2.71	1. Program review is clearly written 2. Learning outcomes are well articulated' 3. Learning outcomes integrate institution-wide values 4. Findings are linked to learning outcomes	1. Need executive summary 2. Address resources and faculty under capacity 3. Compare main campus data to RCA 4. Provide timeline for action plans

General Education Programs

Community Service 2010	5/31/11 Mean = 2.28	1. Finding section is well written and connects well with learning outcomes 2. Good use of direct measures of student work—integration paper and supervisor ratings of students	1. Mention goals and objectives in procedures and findings 2. State learning outcomes in measurable terms 3. Include role of adjunct faculty 4. Describe the advising process for GE 5. Make action recommendations better connected to evidence
Humanities 2010	5/31/11 Mean = 2.43	1. Strong summary of assessment process and results 2. Helpful and well-referenced appendices	1. List student learning outcomes in Executive Summary 2. State learning outcomes in measureable terms 3. Refer to capacity issues to meet student need in terms of availability of courses and faculty 4. Connect data analysis to learning outcomes more directly 5. Connect actions recommendations to assessment directly
Information Literacy 2010	2/2/12 Mean = 3.33	1. Survey/Test is well constructed following national standards 2. Findings are presented and interpreted well 3. Helpful appendices	1. Low response rate but has good cross-section 2. Data is usable and has valuable information 3. Format of document is not standard but it is clearly written 4. Find ways to expend response rate; use hard copy in class settings on main campus and RCA 5. Action recommendations could be more specific 6. Inform research based courses about national standards 7. Consider commercially prepared assessment tools

Natural World 2012	10/18/12 Mean = 3.33	1. Good use of direct and indirect measure of learning outcome 2. Good executive summary 3. Assessment procedures are described in good detail	1. Learning outcomes should be unbundled; too many outcomes rolled into a single learning outcome statement 2. Outcomes may be stated in more measureable terms. 3. Consider using additional indirect measure besides NSSE and CSS, perhaps locally developed 4.Appendix could include examples high and low scoring samples of student work
Quantitative Reasoning 2011	2/2/12 Mean = 3.67	1. Well written and organized 2. Clearly stated and articulated learning outcomes and rubrics 3. Thorough and detailed analysis with direct and indirect measures. 4. Good appendices	1. Recommendations are more focused on process than outcomes 2. Findings suggest Algebra does not seem to address or meet the learning outcomes well, while applied courses do. 3. GE committee should revisit courses that meet Quantitative Reasoning skills 4. Critical thinking should be addressed more explicitly, or revisited by GE as part of QR.

Administrative Units

Academic Advising and Retention 2011	2/2/12 Mean = 3.71	1. Very detailed, thorough and objective 2. Findings capture strengths and weaknesses 3. Qualitative comments on surveys were very informative	1. Findings in the capacity section are not very clear 2. Several of the objectives appear somewhat unrealistic—rethink 3. Indicators section needs to have more direct linkages to goals and objectives 4. All faculty who advise should read this report
Alumni Relations 2011	2/2/12 Mean = 2.36	1.Well-outlined and easy to read 2. Detailed objectives 3. Appendices add value but all should be clearly noted in the text	1. Executive summary should include action recommendations 2. Provide more assessment that goes deeper and provides fuller analysis 3. Assessments seemed somewhat vague; define indicators better and connect to goals 4. Reduce the number of objectives 5. Link action recommendations more directly to findings
Center for Teaching and Learning 2010	5/31/2011 Mean = 2.57	1. Great deal of good evidence collected and presented well	1. Present data, conclusion and recommendations in an organized and accessible clear fashion 2. Include in the Executive Summary the indicators and the process of assessment more clearly 3. State goals in clear and measurable terms 4. Connect more explicitly recommendations to data 5. Connect the findings section more directly to the goal 6. Connect recommendations to evidence more directly 7. Refer to appendices in the narrative
Learning Enhancement Center 2010/2011	5/31/11 Mean = 3.14	1. Overall well-written and well-organized document 2. Excellent Executive summary 3. Helpful and rich appendices	1. Focus on measurable and specific goals 2. Refer to organizational chart in appendix 3. Address all goals systematically 4. Connect recommendations better

Office of Multicultural Services 2010	5/31/11 Mean = 2.29	1. Represents the scope of activities and services very well 2. Action recommendations are reasonable	1. Use organizational chart to clarify reporting lines 2. State goal and objectives in more measurable terms 3. Use better performance indicators to address resources such as comparative data from other institutions 4. Clarify narrative of the findings; tables and graphs could be helpful
Office of Information Technology 2010	5/31/11 Mean = 3.71	1. Overall very well done 2. Executive summary clearly addresses program objectives, findings, and recommendations point by point 3. Goals and objectives clearly state how they will be measured 4. Clearly identifies stakeholders 5. Assessments, outcomes and goals are clearly linked 6. Action recommendations and timelines are linked to findings and evidence	1. Keep on collecting data on an-ongoing bases informed by goal and objectives
University Advancement-Annual Giving 2010	5/31/11 Mean = 3.29	1. Detailed and well written 2. Clear and measurable goals 3. Very helpful data comparison from multiple institutions	1. Suggest explanations for decline of contributions 2. Use measures other than surveys; separate the two questions implied in the question related to "sense of responsibility" 3. Make the connections between findings and recommendations less tenuous
University Counseling Center 2011	2/2/12 Mean = 3.14	1. Description of services and programs were very thorough 2. Great use of assessment tools 3. Findings were well described 4. Appendices add value	1. Review and revise goals to make more measurable 2. Provide summary statement at the end of each section 3. Executive summary could be condensed 4. Provide better separation between findings and qualitative recommendations of outside reviewer

Wilson Library 2009	5/31/11 Mean = 3.29	1. Extremely well organized, good narrative and easy to follow; well put together 2. Learning outcomes were laid out well 3. Assessment documents, instruments and data were well chosen	1. Make the tone more objective. The focus of the document seemed to be more on making case for resources than program review. This may cast a "shadow" of doubt on document. 2. Make better connection between evidence and action recommendation 3. Refer to appendices more consistently

Footnote:

Dimensions of evaluation

1. Executive Summary
2. Learning outcomes/objective and goals
3. Capacity and program description
4. Assessment procedures of learning outcomes
5. Findings
6. Action recommendations
7. Appendices