

## **Guidelines for Program Review Self-Study September 2011**

### **Graduate Programs**

#### **Overview of Program Review at the Graduate Level**

The primary purpose of program review is for improvement of graduate programs as measured by the quality of their faculty, students, curriculum, educational resources and facilities, and the academic reputation of the program among peers. Further, program review assists with planning and setting institutional and academic unit priorities (Council of Graduate Schools, 1990).

At Illinois State University, primary responsibility for quality of academic programs resides with faculty; review of existing academic programs resides with the Academic Planning Committee, an external committee of the Academic Senate. Program Review is carried out in a manner compatible with institutional academic planning mechanisms and guidelines established by the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE).

Reviews result in recommendations for program development and modifications that inform the Department or School, College, and University on decisions regarding resource allocation, faculty staffing, program focus, admissions, curricular content, and other academic matters. The Academic Planning Committee provides these recommendations in summative reports submitted to the Academic Senate, the Illinois State University Board of Trustees, and the IBHE.

The program review process requires review of all degree programs every eight years to monitor quality, identify needed improvements, or make recommendations to boards of control for closure. Under IBHE guidelines, institutions must indicate if a program being reviewed is in good standing or if a follow-up review is needed to resolve concerns regarding program quality. Such programs are “flagged” and reviewed in three years. Institutions may also temporarily suspend the enrollment of programs identified as requiring attention sufficient to warrant such action.

While having similar program review components, graduate programs do have distinct features of purpose, delivery, and financing from undergraduate programs that need to be considered in the review process. Graduate education is advanced in nature based upon the supposition that its students have already successfully attained a baccalaureate degree and, in many instances, have experience in their area of study. Secondly, graduate education is focused, emphasizing depth rather than breadth which is a hallmark of undergraduate education and its general education component. Thirdly, there is the premise of scholarship both by graduate students and the graduate faculty, whereby the concern is not only for the transmission of knowledge, but involvement in the processes for attainment of knowledge (LaPidus, 1989).

#### **Principles of the program review process for graduate education at Illinois State University**

1. The program review process requires a thoughtful and critical self-analysis linked to long-term university priorities aligned with *Educating Illinois*, the University’s strategic plan.
2. Program faculty should fully participate in the self-study process.

3. The unit determines the goals and quality measures that are appropriate for driving improvement in its specific program. Further, the unit is responsible for explanation of its goal and measures selection. Units will look nationally to identify peer or “aspiration” institutions for each quality measure.
4. Units will address comparator programs in Illinois identified by the IBHE for fiscal comparison using data provided by Planning and Institutional Research.
5. The program review document should be outcomes based and provide evidence that the unit is meeting established goals to allow a more accurate determination of program quality. Report writers must support assertions of quality and excellence with evidence.
6. Programs will demonstrate fiscal accountability through a documented planning process tied to budget decision-making.
7. In conjunction with a review of an academic program, Milner Library will conduct a self study of collections and an evaluation of services provided for the discipline.

### **Program Review Process**

#### Data provided:

University Assessment Services, Planning and Institutional Research, Research and Sponsored programs, the Office of the Provost and the Dean of Milner Library will work collaboratively to make the following data available (for each program being reviewed) to the academic unit during the self-study review. Data points are meant to be informative and programs are not expected to address every piece of data in their program review.

#### Planning and Institutional Research:

1. Fall enrollments (previous five years)
2. Enrollments of students from federally defined underrepresented groups
3. Degrees granted (previous five fiscal years)
4. Discipline costs (previous five years)
5. Average GPA of entering students
6. Average GRE of incoming class
7. Student-to-faculty ratio (for Department or School)
8. Instructional credit hour per staff year
9. Faculty profile
10. Number of graduate faculty

#### Graduate School:

1. Data on curriculum changes during the review period
2. Information on how many theses or dissertations were completed, and which faculty members served on those committees
3. Number of majors participating in Graduate Research Symposium

#### University Assessment Services

1. Alumni Survey data – cumulative report
2. Response to the Process for Review of Academic Assessment Plans (PRAAP) as conducted by the Assessment Advisory Council and communicated by UAS (previously provided).

## Research and Sponsored Programs

1. Number of external grant proposals submitted by department faculty
2. Number and dollar amount of externally funded grants
3. Department faculty participation in interdisciplinary research grants

## Milner Library

Program Review Coordinators will work with the appropriate Milner Library Subject Specialist to determine the types of quantitative and qualitative information to be gathered to support the program review process. Coordinators are encouraged to meet with their Library Subject Specialist early in the self-study process to begin this portion of the review. Examples of Milner Subject Specialist Liaison activities and support may be found on page 11 of this document.

## Additional Data:

The following URLs provide access to data that will be useful during the self-study process.

<http://www.pir.ilstu.edu/universityfacts/>

- Enrollment Reports  
Census Day on-campus enrollment by degree program and sequence
- Degree Reports  
Degrees conferred for past five years by academic unit and major
- Credit Hour Reports  
By academic unit – undergraduate (lower and upper division) and graduate credit hours produced
- Links to University Fact Book and Graduate Data Book

<http://www.pir.ilstu.edu/archive/productivity-measure/2010.shtml>

- Student-based Measures
  - Degrees conferred by college, level, academic unit, and major by fiscal year
  - Census Day Headcount enrollment by college, academic unit and major
  - Undergraduate and graduate census day headcount by gender, college and academic unit
  - Summer enrollments by academic unit, major, sequence, college and class level
- Faculty-based Measures
  - Credit hours generated by funding unit (fiscal year)
  - Fall staff by academic unit and employee type
  - Faculty by academic unit, tenure status, and gender

<http://www.pir.ilstu.edu/program-review/>

Program review data sets for comparisons with other programs in Illinois with similar CIP Codes. This is for the section on “IBHE Comparator Programs”.

<http://www.cgsnet.org/Default.aspx?tabid=168> Council of Graduate Schools’ annual Graduate Enrollment and Degrees Report.

The Council of Graduate Schools issues annual reports on degree enrollment, including national data on enrollment trends and demographics in each academic discipline.

### Self-Study:

The academic unit initiates the program review process by conducting a thorough self-study of the academic program. The unit head (Chair or Director) identifies a Program Review Coordinator to coordinate the self-study process culminating in a self-study report. Faculty, students, and staff in the academic unit should be provided the opportunity for meaningful participation in the program review self-study process.

The Program Review Coordinator should contact the Library Subject Specialist for the program to examine relevant holdings and usage statistics collaboratively and to assess the impact of the library on the program. The Coordinator and Subject Specialist should also identify current and future contributions of the library to student learning.

The Associate Provost serves as a liaison to the academic unit to answer questions about the review process. The Assessment Advisory Council and University Assessment Services also provide guidance in matters of student learning outcomes assessment. Units may wish to utilize an external consultant to help identify program strengths and areas for improvement.

### Report:

The academic unit will follow the Program Review Self-Study Report Guidelines approved by the Academic Planning Committee and provided by the Office of the Provost (page 5 of this document). Programs that have undergone an accreditation self-study within two years of the report due date may submit the accreditation self-study report as their program review report. If there are areas required in the program review report not covered by the accreditation report, these must be studied and addressed in a brief addendum to the report. Programs substituting accreditation reports for the self-study report should also provide a 2-3 page executive summary using the format identified in the guidelines and a list that cross-references sections in the accreditation self-study with corresponding components of the program review guidelines.

### Committee Review:

The Academic Planning Committee serves as the primary review committee for program reviews.

### Summative Report:

The Academic Planning Committee will write a summative report of the program, including recommendations for program development and modification that serve to inform the academic unit, college, and University on decisions regarding resource allocation, faculty staffing, program focus, admissions, curricular content, and other academic matters. A draft of the summative report is provided to the unit head and appropriate dean for review and comment. The Academic Planning Committee will meet with the unit head and the dean to review the summative report prior to its inclusion in the Academic Plan.

### Final Reporting:

The Academic Planning Committee submits the summative reports to the Academic Senate as part of the University's Academic Plan. The Academic Plan then moves forward to the Illinois State University's Board of Trustees for approval before being submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Subsequently, the Provost, in consultation with the President, works with appropriate Deans and academic unit heads to follow up on program review recommendations.

## Academic Program Review Self-Study Report Guidelines:

Department/school needs to submit one document describing characteristics of the academic unit called “Overview of Academic Unit”. Program may decide which items to include in this overview of the Unit and which items are degree program specific and need to be included in the program review (e.g., advisement or library instruction). The Department/School needs to submit just one “Overview of Academic Unit” document even if multiple degree programs are being reviewed. For each degree program, a second document will be submitted which contains the “Academic Program Review” using the following format:

### Overview of Academic Unit

1. Outstanding Characteristics (uniqueness and quality)
2. Facilities
  - a. Overview of current facilities
  - b. Equipment purchase and maintenance plan (may be included as an appendix to the self-study report)
3. Academic Advisement and Career Advisement including process for evaluation of quality of academic advisement. (unless different for degree programs. Can be included in degree program review document).
4. Library – collaborative review of periodicals, databases, other resources and services with appropriate Milner Library subject specialist. Should include on-line resources. Review to describe how program and/or faculty:
  - a. Integrates library facilities, collections, and services into research and learning (e.g. enhancement of information literacy skills);
  - b. Interacts/collaborates with library subject specialist in order to improve services to students and faculty
  - c. Contributes to selecting library resources that facilitate student learning and faculty research
  - d. Utilizes technology to enhance library and information use
  - e. Assesses success of collaboration between library and program in achieving learning and research goals

---

For each degree program, submit a second document which contains the “Academic Program Review” using the following format:

### Academic Program Review Self-Study Report Guidelines (~30 pages):

**Section I:** Executive Summary of Review Report for Submission to the Academic Senate, the Board of Trustees and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (2-3 pages using following format.)

- A. Summarize (in one paragraph per heading) each of the following components from the program review document.
  1. Description of self-study process
  2. Overview of degree program being reviewed
  3. Curriculum of degree program
  4. Off-campus programs, if any
  5. Faculty of degree program or unit
  6. Goals and quality measures for the program
  7. Budget Planning process
  8. Description of any accreditation that this program receives from an affiliated agency including results of the most recent review
  9. Summary and effectiveness of Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

10. Summary of initiatives and plans for next three to five years including plans for program improvement
- B. Provide a description and assessment of any major changes in the program since the last review in the following areas:
    1. Changes in the overall discipline or field
    2. Changes in level of student demand
    3. Changes in overall societal need
    4. Institutional context (i.e., University mission) for offering this degree
    5. Other elements of change appropriate to the discipline
  - C. Actions taken since the last review including instructional resources and practices, curricular changes and response to recommendations for program improvement.
  - D. Description of major findings and recommendations as a result of this review and based on student learning outcomes, identification of opportunities for program improvement.
  - E. Actions to be taken as a result of this review including changes in instructional resources and practices, curriculum, and assessment of student learning.

### **Section II: Description of Self-study Process**

Provide a description of the process used to conduct the self-study including faculty and student involvement and timeframe for the self analysis and review. Include the process for gathering feedback from key stakeholders such as alumni and/or employers.

### **Section III: Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations**

Narrative summary addressing previous program review recommendations (~one page)

### **Section IV: Description and Analyses of Program**

- A. Overview of degree program being reviewed
  1. Alignment of program goals with mission and goals of *Educating Illinois*.
  2. Per Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) guidelines, the review of a degree programs must demonstrate how it supports one or more goals of *The Illinois Public Agenda*, the IBHE's Strategic Initiative. Each program does not have to contribute to every goal, but it must contribute to at least one. For more information about each of the four goals of *The Illinois Public Agenda*, go to the IBHE web site: <http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/masterPlanning/materials/ExecutiveSummary.pdf>
  3. Student recruitment activities including availability of department/school scholarships. Discuss enrollment trends for the past five years relative to enrollment targets.
  4. Discuss efforts to track alumni. Where are graduates employed or enrolled in further graduate studies? How does the degree enhance their success in specific employment fields or graduate programs? Provide evidence of employment trends along with any other pertinent outcomes.
  5. Commitment to enhancing the diversity of student major population
  6. Financing of Graduate Students, Utilization of Graduate Assistants; and Graduate Teaching Assistant Training
  7. Review the appropriate data on the program in the Graduate Data Book and describe any trends over the review period as they relate to goals and changes in the program and/or discipline in general. <http://www.pir.ilstu.edu/universityfacts/>
  8. Description of any accreditation that this program receives from an affiliated agency including results of the most recent review

B. Curriculum of degree program being reviewed

1. Describe the program's current Assessment Plan and any recent modifications to the plan. You must describe how assessment data have been used to inform program revisions and modifications. Feedback from key stakeholders (current students, alumni, employers, graduate schools, etc.) must be included in the assessment process.

Address the following four elements evaluated during the PRAAP Process (page 12):

- a. Stated goals
- b. Systematic approach to assess goals
- c. Input from key stakeholders
- d. Using assessment data to inform curricular changes

Provide a link to the degree program's current assessment plan. (Note: the IBHE requires that the degree program's current Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan must be on file with University Assessment Services. This review should link to that plan off the UAS Web Site).

2. Discuss the overall design of curriculum and course offerings. How often are subwaivers and exceptions requested on students' degree audits? Are there any patterns of common exceptions and/or substitutions? Does the program have any plans to address those needs (for example through curricular change, or changes in course scheduling)?

What is the average time-to-degree for majors? Are students graduating in a reasonable and expected amount of time? Of the students graduating from this program during the review period, how many are past the catalog limit on time to degree? Of the students still in the program but not yet graduated, how many are past the catalog limit on time to degree? Does the program have any plans to address time to degree issues? (Note: Consult Planning and Institutional Research data and comment on program differences from ISU averages)

3. Library: What are the broad information processing skills needed in this degree program (e.g., research, citation, finding and using data)? How are these skills introduced and taught to students? How do the library subject specialists collaborate with discipline faculty?
4. How do co-curricular activities for graduate students support the mission of the department and enhance the learning objectives of the degree program?
5. Are distance education courses offered as part of this program? Which courses are on-line? How are decisions about which courses are taught using distance education technology made? Have faculty who are teaching those courses participated in faculty development opportunities related to teaching distance education courses? Could a student take this entire program as a distance education program? If so, has this been beneficial for student recruiting and/or serving less traditional populations of students? Is the same Assessment Plan used for distance education courses? (*see the definitions for distance education courses and programs below*)

A "Distance Education Course" is defined as one in which 75% or more of the instruction and interaction occurs via electronic communication, correspondence, or equivalent mechanisms, with the faculty and students physically separated from each other. This includes both synchronous and asynchronous interaction. A "Distance Education Program" is one in which a student could earn a degree by taking 50% or more of the work in the distance education courses.

6. How actively do students in this program participate in research and creative process activities such as presenting at research symposia, exhibitions, and professional conferences? How does the

program track graduate students' participation in such activities?

- C. Off-campus programs – Has this degree program been offered at an off-campus site within the past five years? If so, please address the following:
1. How does the academic unit assure appropriate oversight of instruction at off-campus sites?
  2. Which faculty teach at the off-campus site? Do these faculty teach the same courses on-campus? If additional faculty are hired to teach at the off-campus site, please describe the professional credentials of these faculty.
  3. How do students at the sites connect with advisors?
  4. How are library and computer services made available to students at the sites?
  5. Is the same Assessment Plan (for assessment of student learning) used for the off-campus program as for the on-campus program? Are assessment data collected and analyzed separately for on- and off-campus programs?
  6. Describe the reporting and feedback mechanisms that address concerns or problems by students at the sites.
  7. Describes the facilities used off-campus for this program.
  8. How did the academic unit recruit students into this off-campus program?
- D. Faculty of degree program or unit:
1. Describe general qualifications of faculty. Do all T/TT faculty hold a terminal degree? If not, why were exceptions made? What qualifications do NTT faculty possess? Are all eligible faculty members of the graduate faculty?
  2. What are the general program expectations for scholarly productivity?
  3. Indicators of quality teaching including evidence of best practice
  4. Diversity of faculty and/or plans for recruiting for diversity
  5. Typical faculty assignment (TT and NTT)
  6. Evidence of leadership of faculty in discipline at national level (in research, teaching or service)
  7. Professional development opportunities provided to faculty. How does the Department/School help faculty develop throughout the life of their career?
  8. How does the department/school hold faculty accountable for productivity and provide resources necessary to sustain a long term career in higher education?
  9. Submit an electronic file with vitas for all T/TT faculty with this report. No standardized format is necessary.
- E. Goals and quality measures for the program (description on page 11 of this document)
1. Indicators of quality in the discipline/field
  2. Peer comparison or aspiration programs for each of these quality measures
  3. Brief summary of program relative to IBHE comparator programs  
<http://www.pir.ilstu.edu/program-review/>

#### **Section V: Program Goals and Planning Processes**

- A. Summary of initiatives and plans for next three to five years including plans for program improvement
- B. Link to the Unit or Program Strategic Plan.
- C. Budget Planning Process (tied to fiscal decision making)
  1. What is the budget planning process utilized in the department? How is it tied to strategic planning?
  2. Understanding that resources are limited, how are resources allocated between degree programs within the Department/School?
    - a. Identify any significant reallocations made since the last program review
    - b. Based on initiatives and plans for the next three to five years, do you anticipate any significant reallocations?
    - c. Describe the Department's equipment purchase and maintenance plan.

### Timeline for Fall 2012 Report Submission

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
October, 2011	Meeting with unit heads and program review coordinators re: program review guidelines	Associate Provost
October, 2011 – August, 2012	Unit faculty conduct program review self-study	Program Review, Coordinator, Chairperson/Director
March, 2012	Program Review data provided to Chairperson/Director	Associate Provost, PIR, UAS
September 1, 2012	Program Review Self-Study Report due to Chairperson or Director	Program Review Coordinator
September 15, 2012	Program Review Self-Study Report due to Dean's Office	Chairperson/Director
October 1, 2012	Program Review Self-Study Report due to Office of the Provost	Dean
November, 2012	"Site-visit" interviews with program faculty and Chairperson or Director (if needed)	Associate Provost, APC
November, 2012–January 2013	APC writes Summative Reports	Associate Provost, APC
February 1, 2013	Summative Reports draft distributed to Chairpersons/Directors and Deans	Associate Provost
February, 2013	APC meets with Program Review Coordinator, Chairperson/Director, and Dean to review Summative Report draft	Associate Provost
March 1, 2013	Summative Report drafts due to Provost for review	Associate Provost
March, 2013	APC writes final Summative Report	Associate Provost, APC
April 1, 2013	Summative Reports (as part of Academic Plan) provided to Academic Senate	Provost, Associate Provost,
July, 2013	Summative Reports (as part of Academic Plan) provided to Board of Trustees	Provost, Associate Provost,
August, 2013	Summative Reports provided to IBHE	Provost, Associate Provost

### **Comparison to peer institutions or national standards for program quality**

Each program is asked to identify measures/indices of quality and look for external comparators. External comparators are programs at other universities that are known for quality in a particular area.

The purpose for such a comparison:

- Determine which quality indices are most appropriate for the program under review.
- Set program goals for achievement of excellence in these quality indices.
- Identify programs at the national level that exemplify excellence in a quality index area.
- Prompt programs to focus externally and plan for on-going improvement.

Examples of quality indices include:

- Quantitative indicators such as student:faculty ratio, number of graduates who enroll in advanced-level graduate programs, number of graduates who obtain employment in field of study, or admission standards for majors.
- Descriptive indicators such as the scholarly accomplishments of program faculty, strong faculty professional development programs, unique curricula, excellent facilities, and unique capstone programs or internship experiences.
- Descriptive indicators such as wide use of best teaching practices, ongoing faculty participation in teaching development programs, or service to the profession at the national level.
- Contribution to the knowledge on teaching and learning in the discipline (SoTL)

### **Examples of Milner Subject Specialist Liaison activities and support**

- Faculty Visits for Classroom Pedagogy
- Faculty Visits for Research Support
- Faculty Visits for Collection Development Research
- Attend Teaching Department Meetings
- Attend Teaching Department seminars and lectures
- Office hours in the department/program/school
- Serve in disciplinary professional library organizations
- Attend disciplinary professional library organizational events
- Attend disciplinary professional organizational
- Participate in faculty and student orientations
- Create online resources for department/program/school and its courses
- Schedule research consultation appointments with faculty and students

**Assessment Advisory Council (AAC)  
Process for Review of Academic Assessment Plans  
(November 2005)**

---

By fall 2004, each academic department/school was to have on file for annual review its academic assessment plan, which must contain the critical elements consistent with effective educational practice, as well as Goal 5 of the IBHE *Illinois Commitment*. The role of the members of the AAC was to examine the documents during the 2004-05 academic year and to recommend an annual process that both satisfies the requirement by the IBHE and facilitates a reasonable and appropriate exercise for chairs, directors, and faculty. The following process was approved in November 2005.

The assessment plans will be reviewed using a rubric developed by the members of the AAC (see attachment) which represents both the necessary elements and a range of sophistication and completion within each. The focus of the examination is the evidence within the program's plan that reveals a systematic and dynamic assessment process.

Beginning with the 2005-06 academic year the AAC will review assessment plans based upon the Program Review Schedule. Each fall the AAC will review the current assessment plans of schools/departments who have programs schedule for Program Review two years from the fall the review is initiated. The specific schedule of activities is as follows:

- a. Chairs/directors submit completed academic assessment plans (by academic major) to the Director of University Assessment Services (UAS) via e-mail or disk (UAS staff posts the plans on UAS web site at <http://www.assessment.ilstu.edu/program>) as modifications are made.
- b. Each fall semester a two or three-person team within the AAC reviews the elements of the plan using the assessment plan rubric and records comments and questions, and returns the report to UAS.
- c. In February/March (~20 months from the Program Review deadline) of the spring semester, the Director of UAS contacts the chair/director to discuss the feedback provided by the AAC peer-review team. The results may necessitate revisions or additions to the public plan.
- d. UAS staff will provide consultation to the chairs/directors in the development of any suggested modifications. It is recommended that changes be finalized 14-16 months before the Program Review deadline.
- e. A final report of "Academic Assessment Plan Status" is submitted to the appropriate Dean's Office.

On-going assumptions and processes:

- a. It is assumed that the chair/director and faculty within a discipline will continue to engage in educational processes that improve the academic program through curricular planning, delivery, and assessment of student learning outcomes.
- b. It is appropriate and expected that the documents submitted to the AAC will be a summary of the more detailed plan being used at the department/school level.
- c. The feedback supplied by the peer-review team from the AAC is designed to be formative in nature, with the intent to provide constructive comments that may be useful to the chair/director.
- d. The director of UAS will be available to assist the academic unit in any areas requested in order to facilitate improved processes and strategies. If there are perceived deficiencies in the documentation of the plan or the plan itself, the director of UAS and the chair/director of the academic unit will work together to develop an action plan for improvement. Follow-up and reporting mechanisms will be designed on a case-by-case basis.

- e. Once the program's documented assessment plan is determined to be at least "established" (according to elements within the "Status and Implementation Rubric"), the chair/ director will be expected to submit to UAS a one-page "update" annually, independent of the Program Review process (on or about March 15). This update should document any revisions made to the plan within the previous year, as well as changes and improvements made to the program *based on evidence reviewed as a result of assessment-related strategies*. Additionally, the report could document conclusions that have been drawn as a result of recent evidence that supports past changes to the curriculum. In other words, is there evidence that curricular or other revisions have resulted in the desired outcomes?
- f. The AAC will review the "annual update" documents and give formative feedback to chairs/directors.

<b>Elements</b>	<b>Undeveloped</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>Program goals and intended student learning outcomes</b>	Absence of program goals and intended student learning outcomes	Program goals are developed, but intended student learning outcomes are only partially developed	Program goals and intended student learning outcomes are developed but lack disciplinary uniqueness	Program goals and intended student learning outcomes are developed and reflect the uniqueness of the program and clearly relate to college and/or institutional mission.
<b>Systematic assessment of student learning (methodologies and capture points appropriate to the discipline)</b>	Absence of methods of assessment, or plan for implementation	Methods of assessment, and procedures for implementation are partially developed, but lack multi-method and multi-measure approach	Implementation of several assessment activities (methods and procedures) are developed to assess most learning goals and intended outcomes	Systematic assessment of student learning using multiple qualitative and quantitative measure, and reflects the uniqueness of the academic program and discipline
<b>Feedback from key stakeholders (indirect measures)</b>	No evidence of collection of feedback from students, alumni, or employers at the program level	Feedback is gathered from some stakeholders on a limited basis, for limited purposes	Feedback is gathered from key stakeholders (at least current students and alumni) through a number of methods, and is disseminated for analysis at the program level	Feedback is gathered from all key stakeholders (current students, faculty, alumni, employers of graduates, graduate schools, etc.)
<b>Analysis of results/feedback mechanisms and response</b>	No analysis of student outcomes is evident; no action or response identified or implemented	Some evidence of a periodic review of student learning outcomes for some learning goals; response or action identified but not implemented	Evidence of formal review process of actual student learning outcomes for most program goals; response or action based on feedback identified and implemented for most learning outcomes	Evidence of a formal and effective feedback & improvement mechanism: program faculty are engaged in a regular assessment and review process, with student learning and stakeholder feedback used to improve curriculum, instruction, and learning

