

University of La Verne
External Reviewer Guide
For
Program and Department Reviews

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The responsibility of the external peer reviewer is to appraise the ability of the program to deliver its curriculum effectively, to assess how well the program addresses its learning outcomes and meets student needs for careers and advanced study, and to identify strengths and weaknesses of the overall program.

1. The reviewer receives the program review or self-study prepared by the department of program ahead of time and is familiar with its content when s/he visits the campus.
2. The reviewer is invited to visit with the program.
3. The reviewer has the opportunity to meet with the chair, faculty, students, college dean, and any other staff member attached to the program.
4. The reviewer has the opportunity to inspect the facilities and resources of the program.
5. The reviewer writes a brief report of roughly five to ten pages that responds to the following elements of the program review:
 - a. Learning outcomes, e.g.,
 1. Has the program clearly articulated its program goals and objectives for majors/minors?
 2. Has the program clearly articulated its learning outcomes for majors/minors?
 3. Does program meet generally accepted standards for its discipline?
 4. If appropriate, comment on the nature and quality of program offering in on- and off-campus electronic and distance-education formats.
 5. If appropriate, comment on the nature and quality of program offerings such as internships, student teaching, students assistantships, student research opportunities, or other workplace/discipline experiences that are part of the curriculum.

- b. Program capacity (curriculum, facilities, equipment, resources, faculty, staff, support services, etc.), e.g.,
 - 1. Has the program faculty demonstrated satisfactory achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activities appropriate to the discipline?
 - 2. Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment, resources, staff, and support services?
 - c. Methods and procedures to assess learning outcomes, e.g.,
 - 1. Has the program clearly articulated and applied its methods and procedures for assessing program goals, objectives, and outcomes?
 - 2. Have students within the program demonstrated satisfactory achievement in research, scholarship, or creative activities appropriate to the discipline?
 - 3. How would you rate the students in this program based on their disciplinary knowledge, general academic knowledge, application of disciplinary knowledge, research experience, and satisfaction with the program?
 - d. Action recommendations (the reviewer is encouraged to make further recommendations for action), e.g.,
 - 1. Are recommendations appropriate and informed by the data?
 - 2. How could the curriculum of this program be improved over the next five years?
 - 3. What actions would be required to accomplish that improvement given current levels of resources (faculty, staff, facilities, equipment, resources)?
 - e. Overall health of the program (its strengths and weaknesses)
6. The reviewer provides an oral exit report to the dean and the department or program chair.
7. The reviewer provides the written report to the dean and the program chair within 15 days of the visit.

Note: Any observations on discrete issues unsuitable for a public document should go directly to the dean in a separate letter.

10/12/2009