MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

Academic Program Review
Guidelines for Programs

Overview and Purpose of Program Review

Program review provides an opportunity to take a comprehensive look at an academic program and guide changes in the curriculum, pedagogy, and faculty development. The primary purpose of this review is to analyze the current state of the program and plan for improvements in the student learning experience by engaging the full range of constituents (full-time and adjunct faculty, students, employers and advising professionals) in critical review and discussion. The program review process is designed to explore how effectively programs achieve the following outcomes:

1. Offer a curriculum that is comprehensive, relevant, and cohesive and related to the mission
2. Maintain sufficient enrollment to be a sustainable major at the university
3. Provide sufficient advisement to program majors
4. Offer a program in which majors can graduate on a timely basis
5. Support and prepare its majors for internships and ultimately employment and further education
6. Ensure appropriate faculty staffing levels and other resources

The program review will inform decisions made by the schools and the Academic Program Budgeting and Planning (APBP) Committee about allocating resources including program continuation, space, equipment and materials, and faculty positions. Academic program review data is also used in Marymount's accreditation reporting to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

Timeline

Ordinarily, university programs are reviewed every six years. The Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE), in consultation with the provost and Dean's Council, coordinates the schedule of reviews and notifies programs when they are scheduled for review. Programs may request an alteration of their scheduled review when circumstances warrant it, usually to align with accreditation reporting. The provost may also initiate unscheduled reviews in exceptional circumstances

Programs are asked to remain mindful that APBP reviews an average of eight programs each year, making adherence to deadline essential to the process's success.

Spring-Summer	• Deans and APBP confirm program review schedule for the following year. In June, PIE prepares program review data.
By September 15	• The director of institutional assessment contacts the program for an initial meeting and sends the standard data set for analysis of the program and updated program classification information.
By December 15	• Programs resolve all data questions, discrepancies, and concerns in consultation with PIE • Programs send name and affiliation of approved reviewer to PIE.
By January 15	• Programs submit draft report to the School dean and copy the director of institutional assessment. The director of institutional assessment reviews the report

	for completeness and notifies program of any discrepancies within one week of receipt of the document. Once clearance is received, the dean sends the report to the approved reviewer.
During February	• The external reviewer visits Marymount.
By March 15	• **Programs submit final report to the dean and copy the director of institutional assessment for forwarding to APBP.**
During April and May	• Program review reports are reviewed by APBP, and results are communicated to the dean, and through the dean, to the program.

Budget and University Resources

Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management will cover all costs associated with the visit of the external reviewer: this typically includes travel, accommodation, and a small honorarium. PIE will work with offices across campus to make data available for programs undergoing review. In addition, PIE can provide advice, consultation and assistance on many aspects of the program review process, including facilitating planning meetings, developing action plans, and providing assistance in survey design. PIE's website provides programs with additional information, templates, and suggestions.

Academic Program Budgeting and Planning (APBP) Review Process

APBP reviews all program reviews to gain insights into the program, ensure completeness and quality of report submitted, and to gather relevant information for planning and budgeting purposes. During the APBP review of the report:

- The Dean of the program under review leads the discussion
- The department chair or program director may be invited to join the discussion at the dean's discretion.
- If the department chair or program director is a member of APBP, he or she may participate in the conversation.
- The relevant Dean gathers any commendations or concerns from the committee regarding the program and the report.
- The committee votes on the continued viability of the program for the next six years.
- If a committee member is involved in the program under discussion, that member must recuse himself/herself from the vote on program viability.

Following the discussion, the relevant Dean sends a memo to the department chair or program director outlining APBP’s findings with copies sent to the provost and posted to APBP’s Canvas site. The memo includes the results of the vote on viability and provides any commendations and concerns raised by the committee. Requests for additional or clarifying information may also be included in the memo. If concerns about the program viability exist, APBP will request a remediation plan and/or interim reports(s) prior to the next scheduled review.

Tips for the Program Review Process

- Consider holding a retreat or other in-depth discussion among all faculty about program direction, priorities, and needs. Consider using a facilitator from outside the program; this can often improve the effectiveness of these meetings and increase participation from all parties.
- Divide the workload. This review should reflect input of all program faculty. Consider using a secure cloud-based drive, the MU shared drive, or other files sharing methods to facilitate collaboration.

- Encourage transparency. Engage related departments or administrative units. Involve students, staff, and alumni.
- Be concise and objective. Reports that speak only to strengths are easy to dismiss as public relations. Use this opportunity to reflect objectively and identify areas where attention should be paid. Focus on the main points and stay on track with page limits.
- Seek advice. Use PIE as a resource to answer questions and provide consultation and guidance.
- Plan ahead. This is a valuable opportunity to take a close look at ways to improve your program and ensure it remains relevant and strong in a rapidly changing environment. Don't wait until the last minute to write the report.

Report Format

The program review report should demonstrate the critical review of the current effectiveness of the program. The primary audience for the report is the external reviewer, in its initial draft, and your colleagues on APBP in its final form. While some description and context may be necessary for the committee to understand the programs' analysis, the majority of the report should focus on evaluating and interpreting the findings of the process. Departments are encouraged to strive for brevity and reports are typically not to exceed 35 pages.

The components of the report are as follows:

- **Background – Program Context**
  - Table: Update on Changes Since Last Review
- **Component 1 -- Review of the Current Program: Curriculum**
  - Table: Map of Curriculum and Program Learning Outcomes
  - Table: Map of Courses and Core Competencies (*Undergraduate Programs Only)*
  - Table: Map of Courses and Graduate Competencies (*Graduate Programs Only)*
- **Component 2 -- Review of the Current Program: Faculty, Resources, and Cooperation**
  - Table: Faculty Roster
- **Component 3 – Benchmarking of Program**
  - Table: Benchmarking Summary Sheet
- **Component 4 – Enrollment, Graduation, and Alumni Outcomes**
  - Table: Program Data
- **Component 5 – Student Input**
  - Table: SWOT Analysis
- **Component 6 -- Advising**
  - Table: Graduating Student Survey: Results of Questions Related to Advising Survey
- **Component 7 – External Reviewer**
  - Attach: Reviewer's Report
- **Component 8– Developing an Action Plan**
  - Table: Action Plan
- **Component 9 – Reporting on Action Plan Progress**
  - Table: Action Plan Progress

PROGRAM REVIEW

Background – Program Context

The purpose of this section is to provide the external reviewer and the Academic Policy, Budget, and Planning Committee with the context to read and understand this program review.

Task 1 – Official Program Description

- Copy and paste the program's description and outcomes from the current Marymount catalog.

Task 2 – Status of the Discipline

- Include a brief description of the status of the discipline and detail emerging trends and issues. To what extent is the program's field of study remaining viable? How is the environment changing in a way that will affect demand or reshape the field?

Task 3 – Changes Made Since Last Program Review

- Specify the date of the previous review. Briefly outline the major findings and recommendations of the previous review and the department and administration's responses. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the department and its programs? Did the faculty and administration agree with the recommendations?

- Update the specific planned actions from the last program review.

GOAL	ACTION TAKEN	IMPACT ON PROGRAM

- What actions is the program currently undertaking to increase enrollment and/or distinctiveness?

Task 4 – Additional Context

- Describe any additional information about the program that is relevant to understanding this program review.

Task 5 – Program Review Process

- Briefly describe how the program went about developing this program review, describing faculty and other constituency involvement in the process.

Component 1 – Review of the Current Program: Curriculum

The purpose of this section is to:

- Review the curriculum to evaluate its effectiveness at addressing learning outcomes
- Examine the contribution of the discipline to the University through support of the liberal arts core or achievement of graduate competencies.

Task 1 – Map student learning outcomes. Address the following:

- Are all intended learning outcomes covered in courses?
- Does the sequencing of courses support and build upon concepts as needed for student learning?
- Is the program cohesive and intentional with clear progression of student learning and courses?
- Do the outcomes reflect what students should be learning to be prepared for professional and educational opportunities ahead of them?
- Does the program offer a curriculum that is comprehensive, relevant, and cohesive?
- Discuss any findings, especially inconsistencies. If there are inconsistencies, please provide solutions.
- To what extent does the program offer courses online? If the program offers courses in both online and traditional formats, please discuss how the program ensures that students are achieving outcomes at least at the level of traditional students.

Map of Curriculum and Program Learning Outcomes

List and label (e.g., 1-6) the learning outcomes.
List all required courses for the major in column on the left.
For each course indicate which outcomes are addressed using the following key.
Level of instruction: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the senior or exit level
Assessment: PR- project, P-paper, E-exam, PO – Portfolio, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-Other (explain briefly)

Course	LEARNING OUTCOMES					
	Learning Outcome 1		Learning Outcome 2		Learning Outcome 3	
	Level	Assessment	Level	Assessment	Level	Assessment

Task 2 – Review student learning outcome assessment reports from the last five years. The purpose of this narrative:

- Provide a holistic examination of how well students are achieving program learning outcomes.
- Summarize changes made as a result of previous assessment findings and illustrate the impact of those changes.

Task 3 – Map courses to the core/graduate competencies. The purpose of the task is to examine the extent to which the program supports and reinforces the core or provides opportunities for graduate students to achieve required competencies.

- Describe the discipline's contribution to the liberal arts core, in the case of undergraduate programs
- Describe the program's integration of core/graduate competencies into the major/program requirements.

Map of Courses and Core Competencies (*Undergraduate Programs Only)*

List all the courses in the discipline in the column on the left.
Identify the type of course using the following key: R – Program requirement, E – Program Elective, C – Core, UR – University requirement
For each course indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.
Level of instruction: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the senior or exit level
Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, PO – Portfolio, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-Other (explain briefly)

Course	Type	Critical Thinking		Inquiry		Information Literacy		Written Communication	
		Level	Assess	Level	Asses	Level	Assess	Level	Assess

Map of Courses and Graduate Competencies (*Graduate Programs Only)*

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of institutional assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the graduate program competencies.
Level of instruction: F-foundational, A-advanced, M-mastery
Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Critical Reading[1]		Written Communication		Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument		Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline		Scholarly Presentation and Use of Resource Materials	
	Level	**Assess**	**Level**	**Assess**	**Level**	**Assess**	**Level**	**Assess**	**Level**	**Assess**

[1] Graduate program competencies derived from GSC Committee Requirements for New Graduate Programs: "Achieving this criteria may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

1. Course content that is increasingly more complex and rigorous than UG courses (course objectives, learning activities, outcome expectations, etc.)
2. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in reading critically.
3. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in writing clearly.
4. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in arguing persuasively.
5. Coursework that produces graduates competent in identifying, investigating, and applying theory and principles of the discipline to new ideas, problems, and materials.
6. Competence in the scholarly presentation of the results of independent study and in the use of bibliographic and other resource materials with emphasis on primary sources for data.
7. A capstone or final integrative activity that demonstrates achievement of graduate-level knowledge and application of the theory and principles of the discipline"

Component 2 – Review of the Current Program: Faculty, Resources, and Cooperation

The purpose of this section is to:

- Review the faculty roster to ensure that the program has sufficient faculty who qualified in the program's field of study.
- Review faculty achievements in teaching, research, and service and ongoing professional development

Task 1 -- Faculty qualifications and activity

- Provide a list of all faculty (full- and part-time), by rank, including tenure status, highest degree earned, graduating institution, and one or two areas of expertise or research interest.
- Provide information on faculty achievements, including peer-reviewed scholarship since the last program review and describe any recent achievements, grants, awards, patents, performances, etc. For recently hired faculty, only discuss achievements since arriving at Marymount.
- Discuss the current workload of the full-time faculty. Is there equitable division of teaching responsibilities? What role do overloads and course releases play in the need for adjunct faculty?
- Identify any holes in the program's faculty area expertise.

Faculty Roster

Complete the roster for all full-time faculty and adjunct faculty for the previous academic year and fall semester. Partially completed draft provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

Name (FT, PT)	**Rank**	**Tenure Status**	**Courses Taught** Including term, course number & title, credit hours	**Academic Degrees and Coursework** Relevant to courses taught, including institution and major List specific graduate coursework, if needed	**Other Qualifications and Comments** Related to courses taught	**Expertise/Research Interests**

Task 2 – Service and Cooperation

- Discuss efforts to promote civic engagement and service among students, faculty, and staff. Describe service learning opportunities and other service promoted by the program. How do faculty and staff engage with the broader public?
- Describe any linkages, collaboration agreements with institutions outside the university, and courses or collaboration with other programs at Marymount.
- List external grants.

Task 3 – Physical Resources

- Describe any relevant physical resources -- dedicated studios, labs, classrooms, etc. -- and evaluate their sufficiency.

Component 3 – Benchmarking of Program

The purpose of this section is to explore how Marymount's program compares to similar programs at other institutions and to professional standards in content and focus. It should also identify additional needed resources for the program to remain competitive and up-to-date.

Task 1 – Using Marymount's Benchmark or Aspirational School Lists, identify two peer/aspirant institutions and one peer/aspirant or competitor institution with the program offering. If the program is not offered at three schools, alternative programs will be identified in consultation with the school dean and vice president.

- If there are accrediting and/or professional standards (e.g., American Psychological Association's *Undergraduate Education in Psychology: A Blueprint for the Future of the Discipline)* that guide the discipline and program, the program may use them as one of the comparisons.

Task 2 – Conduct a benchmarking analysis of the identified institutions. Use the Benchmarking Summary Sheet to record your findings.
The program will want to start with the degree requirements but may also need to conduct interviews of colleagues at the institution. The purpose of the summary is to answer the following questions:

- How do program requirements, course offerings, and content compare to other schools in quantity, scope, and depth?
- Is the program in sync with current trends and best practices in the field?
- What is unique about the Marymount program?
- Based on the findings, what changes (additions or modifications) should the program consider?

Benchmarking Summary Sheet

University Name:			
Contact Information: List names of people interviewed, websites and any other information.			
Briefly explain why the program was chosen.			
What similarities exist between Marymount's program and the institution? Be sure to specifically examine the number of credit hours required.			
What differences exist between Marymount's program and the institution's?			

Component 4 – Enrollment, Graduation, and Alumni Outcomes

The purpose of this section is to illustrate trends in enrollment, graduation and alumni outcomes. Data for this section will be compiled by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness using standardized measures of the institution. Programs seeking additional or clarifying data need to finalize all data by Dec. 15.

Task 1 – Review data provided by Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

Program Data

Provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

	Year 1		**Year 2**		**Year 3**		**Year 4**		**Year 5**	
	FA	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP
Major Enrollment										
Full-time										
Part-time										
Second majors										
Minors										
Discipline Enrollment										
Sections offered										
Credit hours generated										
Average course size										
Number of Faculty										
Full-time faculty in discipline (people)										
Courses taught by full time faculty in discipline										
Courses taught by full time faculty from other disciplines										
Courses taught by adjuncts										
Degrees Conferred										
Number of degrees conferred/year										
Number of certificates (if applicable)										
Alumni Outcomes										
% of graduates employed										
% of graduates employed in field										
% pursued additional education										

Task 2 – Analyze the data in light of any internal or external forces that impact student enrollment, graduation or alumni outcomes.

Task 3 - Address these questions:

1. Does the program maintain sufficient enrollment to be a sustainable major at the university?
2. Does the department have additional data and information on alumni employment and educational outcomes? What does that information say?
3. Does the program adequately support and prepare its majors for employment and graduate school/continued growth and education?

Component 5 – Student Input

The purpose of this section is to gather information on the experiences of students enrolled in the program. Although primarily concentrating on majors, programs with a small number of majors but extensive non-majors (e.g., philosophy) may include non-majors who have taken multiple courses in the area. Standard questions will be used to extract data on students' perception of rigor, instruction, and advising. Additional questions related to program-specific issues may be added.

Task 1 – Gather student input.

- The starting point for this section should be currently available feedback from students in the form of results of alumni, graduating student, and advising surveys, and course evaluations since the last review.
- Additionally, programs should seek more in-depth feedback in the form of additional surveys, focus groups, directed interviews, or other methods as appropriate. These should be conducted in such a way as to ensure confidentiality and honest evaluation of the program, and an explanation of this methodology should be included in the findings of this section.
- The exploration must address the following:
    - Strengths of the program and areas where the program needs to make improvements
    - Extent to which program and university mission and values were explicit throughout the student's educational experience
    - Preparation for internship and careers; how does the program help students obtain internships, and student feedback on this process.
    - Special or unique features of the program
    - Extent to which the program outcomes were emphasized throughout the student's educational experience
    - Extent to which sufficient advisement was given to program majors. Describe what kinds of orientation, advising, and mentoring efforts have been carried out.
    - Courses students would have wanted to take
- If the program offers opportunities for students to take courses online, include feedback from these students. Do they feel adequately supported and engaged?

Task 2 – Use student input and other findings from the program review process to identify major themes regarding program strengths and areas for improvement.

- Identify the strengths, weaknesses (internal to Marymount), opportunities, and threats (external to Marymount) that support or create barriers to achievement of program goals, objectives, and learning outcomes. Themes should inform the external reviewers' discussion with students and the program's action planning.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis

Strengths (Internal to Marymount):	**Opportunities (External to Marymount):**
Weaknesses (Internal to Marymount):	**Threats (External to Marymount):**

Component 6: Advising and Mentoring

The purpose of this section is to examine the quality of academic advising and mentoring for students enrolled in the program. Data for this section will be compiled by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness using results of the Graduating Student Survey. Programs seeking additional or clarifying data need to finalize all data by Dec. 15.

Task 1 – Review data provided by Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

Program Data
Provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	5- yr. Avg.
Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements about MU faculty and advisors.						
Advisors are available at convenient times.						
Advisors are helpful with selecting courses.						
Advisors are knowledgeable about my degree requirements.						
Advisors explored my career options with me.						
Advisors discussed my future education options.						

Task 2 – Describe Advising and Mentoring in the Program.
How are students in the program advised? Do they faculty in the discipline? What role do faculty advisors from other disciplines play? If faculty from other discipline advise or mentor students in the program, how does the program ensure students are getting relevant disciplinary information? If the program has students who take courses primarily online, how does the program ensure that these students have access to the same level of academic support that traditional students have?

Task 3 -- Gather input from program faculty.
Convene a meeting of program faculty to review results of the advising and mentoring questions on the Graduating Student Survey. Invite the assistant/associate dean to attend the meeting to facilitate a review of the data, discuss academic advising and mentoring in the program in general, and identify relevant findings from student focus groups.

The discussion may include the following:
1. Are advising and mentoring duties shared evenly by the faculty in the program?
2. Given the resources available, does advising and mentoring meet the needs of students?
3. What does the program do to orient new faculty to academic advising and mentoring responsibilities and to mentor and encourage existing faculty to follow best practices in advising and mentoring?
4. How do faculty members view advising and mentoring? How do they rate the effectiveness of the process in the program?
5. What do they find most rewarding and most challenging in working with the students?
6. What personal or institutional support do faculty need to make the advising and mentoring process more effective and/or satisfying?

Task 4 -- Identify strengths, weaknesses, and improvements needed related to student advising and mentoring.
Identify successes, challenges, and improvements that the program plans to make over the next six years. These planned improvements should be included in the action plan (component 8) that follows the external review (component 7).

Completion of Draft Report – At this point, programs submit this draft report to the School dean and copy the director of institutional assessment. The director of institutional assessment reviews the report for completeness and notifies the program of any discrepancies within one week of receipt of the document. Once clearance is received, the dean sends the report to the approved external reviewer. The remainder of the report will be completed following the visit of the external reviewer and will be submitted to the dean, and copied to PIE for forwarding to APBP, by Mar. 15**.**

Component 7 – External Reviewer

The purpose of this section is to obtain an external and objective perspective about the program. The program will be asked to recommend three possible reviewers, providing brief credentials and a rationale for their choices, to the dean of the school, who will select one reviewer to forward to the Provost for approval.

The reviewer will be asked to make a one-day site visit, during which he or she will meet with the program's students and faculty, school dean, provost, with faculty from related fields, and, where appropriate, with alumni, employers and other external constituencies as well as any other individuals necessary for formulating a well-informed understanding about the program's current state and future direction. The reviewer will also visit relevant facilities. The program, in consultation with the dean and with the assistance of Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management, will develop the schedule for the visit and make the logistical arrangements.

The reviewer will be asked to prepare a brief report highlighting the findings and recommendations from the visit.

Programs with external accreditation may use that site visit in lieu of this component of the program review.

Task 1 – In consultation with the School dean, identify a candidate to serve as an external reviewer.

- Reviewers should be recognized scholars in their field and usually should be senior faculty members at peer institutions. Exceptions may be made in special cases, where deemed appropriate by the dean. Reviewers should **not** include individuals who have been (or are) an employee, candidate, or consultant with the university over the last five years; in familial or close relationships with individuals at Marymount or with professional connections to the program or its faculty; or in any other way potentially biased in regards to Marymount.
- Send the name, affiliation, and credentials of one or more potential reviewers to the dean for consideration. The dean will select a candidate, subject to approval by the provost.
- If the program is struggling to identify an appropriate reviewer, identify three similar institutions with a similar program. The School dean will contact his or her counterparts and solicit nominations for an external reviewer. All nominations for reviewers will be approved by the provost.
- The dean will communicate with the approved candidate, and the dean's office will make the logistical arrangements for the visit. Travel, accommodation, and a small honorarium ($500) will be provided by Academic Affairs. Reviewers are responsible for making their own travel plans and are expected to pay the cost of transportation, hotel, and meals; the reviewer will be reimbursed for these expenses by Academic Affairs. The reviewer will be provided with an invoice to complete and will be asked to submit all original receipts. The paperwork for reimbursement will be submitted to Accounts Payable when the completed program review report is received, and the reviewer will then be reimbursed and paid the honorarium.

Task 2 – Coordinate the reviewer's documentation and site visit.

- Notify PIE of the reviewer's name and affiliation and the scheduled date of the visit.
- Several weeks in advance of the reviewer's visit, the department chair or academic program director will send the reviewer the program review and all of the supporting materials.
- Schedule meetings and interviews. These should include an entry meeting with the provost, an entry meeting with the dean, meetings with program faculty (both full-time and adjunct), meeting with students, additional meetings as requested by the reviewer, and an exit interview with the dean and/or provost. The program may include meetings with alumni and/or employers and other program constituents.
- The chair or program director should provide an assistant to escort the reviewer to and from meetings.

Task 3 – After receiving the reviewer's comments, draft a response to the reviewer's report that provides clarification, additional material or relevant information.

- Attach both reviewer's report and program's response to the program review.
- If a program is using the report from an external accrediting body, the program should provide a map that crosswalks between the components of this report and the report from the external accrediting body. The program is responsible for ensuring that the report includes responses to each of the components of the MU program review template.

Component 8 – Developing an Action Plan

The purpose of this section is to synthesize the findings of the program review and develop an action plan based on its findings.

Task 1 – Assess the program's engagement with and contributions to the University's mission and strategic plan.

- Evaluate how well the program reflects, supports and advances to Marymount's mission and plan.
- Identify changes and innovations that program will undertake over the next five years to promote the mission and plan. (See Appendix 1 for a planning worksheet to help tie the results of the SWOT analysis to the planning process.)
- Address how the program will improve or maintain its enrollment and program distinctiveness.

Task 2 -- Develop a five-year action plan, based on the findings of the program review. Please identify the following:

1. Goals – Specifically what does the program want to accomplish over the program review cycle?
2. Rationale for goal based on Program Review – Why were these goals selected?
3. Strategy to achieve goal – How will the program achieve the goals? Please give a timeline and milestones.
4. Resources needed to achieve goal – What resources such as funding or needed to accomplish goals?
5. Timeline – What is the schedule for obtaining this goal?
6. Indicators of success – How will the program know that it is being successful?

Action Plan

Goal[2]	Rationale for Goal Based on Program Review	Strategy to Achieve Goal	Resources Needed to Achieve Goal	Timeline	Indicators of Success

[2] Goal: An observable, measurable end result/outcome. Goals usually have attached objectives and strategies to achieve the goal or objectives.

Component 9 – Reporting on Action Plan Progress

The purpose of this section is to report on progress with the action plan developed from the program review. This report should be submitted with the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment report one year after the program review is completed. The Academic Program Budgeting and Planning Committee will review this document.

Task 1 – Respond to the Dean's Letter

Task 2 – Report on action plan progress. Please identify the following:

- Goals – What did the program plan to accomplish over the next five years?
- Action Taken – Describe any actions taken to achieve goal. Include in this description the dates and any relevant information
- Progress – Describe any milestones achieved and what is required or necessary to achieve goal, if goal has not been achieved.

Action Plan Progress

Program Name:
Date:

GOAL	ACTION TAKEN	PROGRESS

Appendix 1: Optional Planning Worksheet

	Opportunities	Threats
Strengths	***Strategies:*** *How can you leverage your strengths to take advantage of your opportunities?*	***Strategies:*** *How can you use your strengths to minimize the threats?*
Weaknesses	***Strategies:*** *What can you do to minimize your weaknesses so they won't stand in the way of your opportunities?*	***Strategies:*** *What can you do to ensure your weaknesses don't prevent you from dealing with the threats? This is a critical point – how can you fix these weaknesses?*