

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Comprehensive Program Review Report | Peer Review

PROGRAM REVIEW (YEAR FIVE) DUE DATE: JUNE 30TH

***The Goal:** To ensure that program [and discipline] curriculum provides appropriate conditions for student achievement of intended program [and discipline] learning outcomes (Palomba & Banta, 1999).*

There are several steps to complete year five of the Program Review. Please reference the Year 5 Instructional document for expanded definitions, guidance and resources.

Comprehensive Program Review Report

The External Peer Review is the culminating validation step of the Comprehensive Program Review. The review provides an independent assessment of program effectiveness, strengths, challenges, opportunities, and alignment with institutional priorities, workforce needs, transfer readiness, student success, and continuous improvement goals.

- Fall Semester: Submission of draft Comprehensive Program Review Report
 - Prepared by:
 - Program Chair/Coordinator
 - Department Faculty
 - Dean

Review Planning Meeting

January

In January, the Program Chair/Coordinator, Dean, Director of Institutional Assessment, and the selected review body will convene for a review planning meeting to formally launch the external peer review process. The purpose of this meeting is to confirm the reviewing body, establish shared expectations for the review, and discuss the evaluation rubric and rating criteria, clarify evidence requirements, develop the review timeline, and determine how the reviewing body will conduct its work.

External Peer Review Complete and Submitted

June 30

- Selection of the Reviewing Body
- Reviewer Orientation
- Submission of completed review

Step One:

Familiarize yourself with the website section on Year Five deliverables, resources, templates, and instructions.

Step Two: Comprehensive Program Review Report

All sections outlined in the Program Review Template:

Executive Summary	Program Narrative
Mission Statement	Program Goals
Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Map Review
Analysis of Program Data	Curriculum & Instruction ▪ High Impact Practices ▪ Culturally Responsive & Inclusive Practices ▪ Labor Market Alignment and/or Transfer Readiness
Program Learning Outcome Assessment	
Course SLO Analysis	
Faculty Preparedness & Professional Development	
SMARTIE Goal Summary	
Appendices and Supporting Evidence	

The draft should be considered substantially complete and ready for external review.

Step Three: Selection of the Reviewing Body

The Program Chair/Coordinator, in consultation with the Dean, will determine which review body will conduct the external peer review. This decision should occur no later than January. The selected review body will determine its own review process

Option 1: Program Advisory Board Review

Option 2: Workforce Training Committee Review

Step Four: Reviewer Orientation Meeting

The Director of Institutional Assessment will facilitate an orientation session to ensure consistency across all reviews by providing guidance on the purpose of program review, the evaluation process, the rating scale, evidence expectations, reviewer roles and responsibilities, and final reporting requirements. This meeting ensures that reviewers have a common understanding of the review framework and are prepared to conduct a thorough, evidence-based evaluation of the Comprehensive Program Review Report.

Step Five: External Review

For consistency across all program reviews, reviewers should will use a metric scale and definitions when assigning ratings. The focus should be on the quality of evidence provided, the degree of implementation, assessment of effectiveness, and evidence of continuous improvement. For each section of the Comprehensive Program Review, reviewers are expected to complete three components to ensure a consistent, evidence-based evaluation process. First, reviewers should Rate the Criterion Measures by assigning a rating. Second, reviewers should provide Reasoning and Evidence to support the rating assigned. This narrative should explain the rationale for the evaluation by highlighting key strengths, areas for improvement, notable findings, and examples presented within the report. Third, reviewers should identify the Evidence Reviewed and, if applicable, note any additional evidence that would strengthen the evaluation.

Step Six: Submit Summary Report by June 30