

Program Review Committee
Committee Reviewer's Feedback
Ten-Year Reports

Date: _____

Review Year: _____

Committee Reviewer: _____

CIP Code: _____

Complete a separate feedback sheet for each degree level
(certificate, associates, bachelors, master's, doctoral, or professional).

Program Name(s)	Degree Level(s)

Review Steps

1. Read through the program review submission. Mark-up the electronic version and add comments for the program where needed. Use the Reviewers Checklist at the bottom of this template to help you identify areas that need further work in the report.

We will share your marked-up version of the report and this completed feedback template with the program representatives in advance of the committee meeting, and the program will use these documents and the committee discussion in completing its revision.

2. After reading the report, you are to summarize in the box below major areas of the report that need to be strengthened before submission to CPE. You may list as many items as you wish, but we ask that you focus on major areas of concern--the program can access information on smaller items in the comments you made in the report itself. Be sure to add positive feedback as well. Also note any steps the program needs to take to prepare for future program reviews.

Be prepared to lead a discussion in the committee meeting around the important areas you have identified. In the meeting, you will lead the committee through the marked-up version of the program review submission, focusing only on the major areas you highlight in the boxes below.

In general, you should consider the following data provided by IRP to be accurate as included in the report.

- 3.c. Time and Credit to Degree
- C. Program Demand/Unnecessary Duplication (enrollment, degrees conferred, credit hour production)
- D.1.a. Instructional FTE

Please cite relevant page and section numbers for your comments.	Page/Section
a)	
b)	
c)	

Feedback to Guide Future Planning and Program Improvement

3. In the box below, please summarize program trends, challenges, issues, or concerns related to the program as it exists within UofL's mission, strategic planning, initiatives, or program expectations (especially focus here on the UofL-related portions of the report--i.e., B. Program Quality and Student Success; Sections F through I; trends related to enrollment changes or degrees conferred; or any other information specifically related to the program within UofL). Please also list positive program efforts.

Please cite relevant page and section numbers for your comments where possible.	Page/Section
a)	
b)	
c)	

Reviewer's Checklist

As you read through each component of the report, reference the component number below for ideas of the type of information you should find in that section of the report. For any items that you would answer “some” or “no” you should add a comment in the marked-up version of the report asking the program to address the missing information in its revision.

Report components highlighted in gray will be reviewed by OAPA.

A.	Program Quality and Student Success	YES	SOME	NO
1	Does this section provide concrete evidence that the program is fulfilling at least one of the university's mission areas? http://louisville.edu/about/			
2	Does this section provide a clear and strong connection between the program and at least one of the CPE Strategic Agenda areas of college readiness; student success; research, economic, and community development; or efficiency and innovation? http://www.cpe.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/A6214030-1C79-4DE1-8CAC-D42B17466BC2/0/StrongerbyDegrees_final_opt.pdf			
3	Does this section show clearly that the program is in alignment with at least one of the CPE Strategic Implementation Plan items? (i.e., adequate funding; accountability; performance metrics and targets; implementation plans; reporting and benchmarking; incentives; balancing quality and quantity) http://cpe.ky.gov/planning/strongerbydegrees/implementation.htm			
B.	Program Quality and Student Success	YES	SOME	NO
1	Does this section provide the following: a. the program's student learning outcomes (from SLO reports)? b. how the program evaluates each outcome (methods used; benchmarks/targets; timeline, etc.)? c. summary/discussion of assessment results? and d. examples of how assessment results have been used to make improvements to the program?			
2	Does this section focus on awards for faculty, students, etc., for the particular <u>degree level</u> under review? Are the awards current (last 5 years)?			
3a	For undergraduate programs, if the required number of hours to complete the program is greater than 125 credits has the program provided an explanation of why?			
3b	OAPA will review this data			
3c	OAPA will review this data			
4	Employer, Student, Alumni Satisfaction with Program	YES	SOME	NO
4a	Does this section describe: a) how it collects data on employer satisfaction with its graduates? b) what the data says about its graduates? and c) how it has used the data to improve the program?			
4b	Does this section describe: a) how it collects data on graduating students' and alumni satisfaction with the program? b) what the data says about its program? and c) how it has used the data to improve the program?			
	If the program hasn't reported on data in this section, has the program provided a plan for collecting it in the future?			
5.	Job Placement, Transfer, Grad School Admission	YES	SOME	NO
5a	Are job placement data reported?			

		Are types of jobs reported?			
5b		Transfer data for AA/AS programs only			
5c		Has the program provided numbers and percentages of students seeking graduate school admission?			
6.		If the program leads to licensure or certification, has the program provided the name of exam and pass rates for all required years?			
C.		Program Demand/Unnecessary Duplication	YES	SOME	NO
1		Do you see any trends in enrollment, degrees conferred, or credit hour production that should be discussed by the committee? Note: The accuracy of this data has been confirmed by OAPA. Any committee discussion should relate to what the data indicate about the program.			
2a		If there are similar programs at other institutions, does the text provide a strong case for how the program is different from those programs?			
2b		Does the text describe specific collaborations with the other programs? Does the text show how collaboration benefits each program?			
D.		Cost and Funding	YES	SOME	NO
1a		Instructional FTE—OAPA will review this data			
1b		Change in faculty size or workload—does the narrative point out any significant issues that should be discussed?			
2 & 3		If the program has provided data on extramural funding in D.2, has it discussed in this section how the funding impacts the program?			
E.		Additional Information	YES	SOME	NO
1		Is there anything in this section that needs further clarification? Is there anything mentioned here that addresses an earlier section and needs to be moved there?			
		END OF CPE TEMPLATE; ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED AFTER THIS POINT REMAINS WITHIN UOFL.			
F.		Program Faculty	YES	SOME	NO
1		Has a list of faculty advising and types of students been provided? Is it for the most recent academic year?			
		Is it specific to the program level under review?			
2		Dissertation--This section should only be completed for doctoral programs.			
G.		Program Enrichment	YES	SOME	NO
1		If the program hasn't noted projects associated with Signature Partnership, i2a, or sustainability, suggest they add this.			
H.		Program Enrichment	YES	SOME	NO
1		Is a copy of the program's curriculum included either in the text of the report or in an attachment?			
		If you have questions about the structure of the program (embedded programs, concentrations, etc.) is there information here that clarifies those?			
2		Has the program provided any text in this section?			
		Has anything mentioned before in the report indicated a change that should be reported here?			
		If the program has mentioned distance learning offerings in this section or earlier in the report, did it discuss the impact of those offerings on the program?			
3		If the program has indicated that it has tracks, specializations, or concentrations, it must address this question. If 50% of the core is not shared has the program provided an acceptable explanation of why?			
I		Plan for Improvement	YES	SOME	NO
1		Has the program discussed its strengths and weaknesses in the context of its prior plan for improvement?			
2		Has the program provided future goals/plans for program improvement?			

		Are the goals/plans provided: a) Achievable? b) Related to the university's mission and 21 st century goals? c) Backed up with rational and reasonable arguments?			
	3	Are any plans to address or incorporate university initiatives included?			
	4	Are strategies and measurable outcomes provided for achieving each goal listed under #2 above?			
	5	Has the program explained how the new goals differ from the previous plan for improvement?			
		Other factors	YES	SOME	NO
		Is anything provided in this section unclear?			
		Should any of this information be included elsewhere in the report? (in addition to here)			