|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program Name: | Degree Designation as on Diploma: |
| Program Implementation Date: | CIP Code: |
| Program Director: | Submission Date: |
| Department Name: | Department Chair: |
| Name of Person Completing the Report: | Dean: |



**University Context**

Final review of the report is to be completed by the unit Dean before submission to the Provost Office. Send the report draft and Dean’s Checklist to the Dean when completed.

Program Review reports must be submitted to the Provost Office by January 3, 2023. Please upload the report and the Dean's Checklist to the program’s “4. Program Review Draft” folder in SharePoint. Let Leslie Harper ([Leslie.Harper@Louisville.edu](mailto:Leslie.Harper@Louisville.edu)) know when the materials have been uploaded.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Program Abstract:  * Provide a short description of the mission and focus of the program. * Also list all tracks, concentrations, or specializations associated with the program. |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. List any program accrediting agency and accreditation cycles (if applicable). | | | | |
| **Program Name and accredited degree level(s)** | **Agency name (include link to webpage)** | **Date of the Last review (month/year)** | **Date of the Next Review (month/year)** | **Note any changes in accreditation status (i.e., sanctions, etc.)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Examine how the program aligns with the university’s mission and strategic priorities. 2. Explain how the program contributes to the institution’s mission. 3. Explain how the program promotes accessibility and equity for strategic populations (underrepresented minorities, underfinanced students)?  * UofL’s Strategic Plan is number four in the program’s “1. Templates” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Explain how this program has contributed to the economic and social welfare goals of HB1 as delineated in the statewide postsecondary education strategic agenda – ***Stronger by Degree***s.   <http://louisville.edu/oapa/program-review/stronger-by-degrees-cpe-2016-2021-strategic-agenda>   * A list of the CPE strategic agenda goals is number five in the program’s “1. Templates” folder in SharePoint. * It is best to choose one or two goals rather than trying to address all of them. |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Briefly describe the program’s Student Learning Outcomes from the past five years and provide evidence on how assessment data was used for program improvement.  * The SLOs are number one in the program’s “2. Past Program Reports and SLOs” folder in SharePoint. | | | |
| **SLO Goal** | **Measure** | **Target** | **Summarize five years of assessment results for the learning outcome.** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Explain how the assessment results have been used to make improvements to the program. | | | |
|  | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Explain the program’s measures of teaching effectiveness and any efforts made to improve teaching effectiveness.  * The teaching effectiveness survey data are number three in the program’s “3. Data” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe any outside funding that program faculty have attracted over the last five years. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe any external awards or other recognition of the students, faculty, and/or program over the past five years. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe overall satisfaction with the program using feedback from students, alumni, and employers.  * If available, student and alumni satisfaction data are number one in the program’s SharePoint “3. Data” folder. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Include graduate school admission data for program graduates.  * If available, the NSC graduate admissions data is number six in the program’s SharePoint “3. Data” folder. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Does this program lead to licensure or certification? Include students’ pass rates on licensure or certification exams if applicable. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Are there similar programs at other public institutions in the state? YES NO   If yes, then explain how the curriculum of this program is different from existing programs at other institutions or that access to these programs is limited at the other institutions.   * This question only covers programs with the same CIP code. If there are programs with the same CIP code in the state, then a report titled “Program Inventory” is number five in the program’s SharePoint “3. Data” folder. If no report is in the folder, then the answer to this question is “No” and no response is needed. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Reflect on the program’s overall score and position within the markets identified by PES+ (i.e., service region, state, regional, and national markets), giving special consideration to the following: 2. Student demand 3. Employability both within and outside of the field 4. Competitive intensity  * The PES+ scorecards are number two in the SharePoint “3. Data” folder. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Discuss the following program trends: 2. Discuss enrollment trends in the program. If enrollment is shrinking, what can be done to grow it? 3. Discuss trends in the degrees conferred for the program. 4. Discuss the program’s average time-to-degree.  * The Cards Analytics data are on page 7 of the Department Health Check, which is in the program’s “3. Data” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Discuss any opportunities for program efficiencies, giving special consideration to the following: 2. Based on the course consolidation opportunities, which program courses may need to have a reduction in sections offered? (See B.iv. in the Health Check.) 3. How many single-section courses could the program offer less frequently based on demand?   (See B.vi. in the Health Check.)   1. How do department per credit hour costs (total and by account category) compare to those for similar departments at R1 benchmark institutions? (See E.ii. in the Health Check.)  * This data is in the Department Health Check located in the program’s “3. Data” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Discuss any opportunities for student progression, giving special consideration to the following: 2. Are there program courses with completion rates below 75%? Does this indicate a problem? If so, what can be done to address it? (See C.ii. in the Health Check.) 3. Are there program courses with high grade variance across sections that warrant further examination? What actions should be taken to address this variance?   (See C.iii. in the Health Check.)   1. How many courses does the program have with a fill rate at or above 90%? Do any of these courses have low completion rates? Should any be offered more frequently or with more sections or expanded capacity? (See B.vii. in the Health Check.) 2. Which gateway courses in your program have had inequitable course grade distributions across strategic student groups (e.g., URM, low-income, first generation, etc.)?  Discuss whether any of these courses should be redesigned or monitored more closely to improve student equity and success. ***[For undergraduate programs only.  Please contact Bob Goldstein to propose courses to add to the report if no gateway or student success courses are currently identified for your program.]*** (See C.vi. in the Health Check.)  * This data is in the Department Health Check located in the program’s “3. Data” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Review any other program strengths and weaknesses in terms of institutional mix or instructional workload; note the program’s student credit hour per instructional faculty FTE for the past five years. (See D.iii. in the Health Check.)   ***[For undergraduate programs only]:*** Undergraduate programs should also consider strengths and weaknesses in terms of intercurricular interdependencies, as defined by the percent of attempted SCH taught to own department majors vs. service department majors). (See A.v. in the Health Check.)   * This data is in the Department Health Check located in the program’s “3. Data” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please provide a progress update on the program’s previous Plan for Improvement and provide an updated Plan for Improvement in the table below.  * If available, the program’s previous Plan for Improvement is at the end of the last Program Review submitted, which is number two in the program’s “2. Past Program Reports and SLOs” folder in SharePoint. |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| List the program's primary goals for the next seven years.   * Include plans for collecting feedback from graduates, alumni, and employers and for collecting job placement and graduate school application data. * Focus on a few (3 or 4) strong goals that when accomplished will improve the program * While you might wish to include a goal related to student learning, you should focus mainly on goals related to improving the program as a whole and save student learning goals for the program’s annual Student Learning Report. | Describe strategies the program can take to achieve each goal, including plans for implementation of strategies and timelines where possible. | Identify outcomes the program can use to measure the achievement of each goal; and set targets, where applicable.  Note: if you are having trouble identifying outcomes for measuring, then the goal probably needs to be revised. | Identify an assessment point for regularly reviewing data on this goal’s outcome.   * For instance, any outcome related to student learning should be incorporated into the program’s SLO reporting process; outcomes related to program change should be incorporated into the program’s strategic planning and other regular program reporting processes. * Progress toward goals should be reviewed regularly in program and department meetings, etc., and decisions made and implemented to result in program improvement. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |