

# Hawaii Pacific University

Evaluating HPU Program Review on Educational Effectiveness  
The Review of the Program Reviews  
September 2011

## Table of Contents

### Part I:

<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
Overview.....	3
Review Team.....	3
Brief History of the HPU Program Review Guidelines.....	4
Summary of the Program Review Process.....	5

### Part II: Analysis of HPU's Program Review Process.....5

Summary of Program Review Reports .....	5
• Advertising & Public Relations.....	5
• Diplomacy & Military Studies.....	5
• History.....	5
• Journalism.....	5
• MarineScience.....	5
• MBA.....	5
• Psychology.....	5
• Teaching English as Second Language.....	5
Quality of Program Review Reports.....	7
• Learning Assessments.....	5
• Program Use of Student Learning Outcomes.....	5
• External Review Reports.....	5
• Program Review Follow-Up Meetings.....	5

### Part III: Evaluations.....9

Comparisons & Contrasts: HPU Program Review Guidelines & WASC Guidelines.....	10
• Alignment of HPU Program Review Model with WASC Best Practices.....	11
• The Effectiveness of the HPU Program Review Process (using WASC rubrics).....	12

### Part IV: Recommendations/Next Steps.....15

Ensuring Program Review Success.....	15
Aligning with HPU's Institutional Quality Improvement Efforts.....	15
Incorporating Results in HPU's Institutional Planning & Quality Assurance Systems.....	15
Review of Learning Assessment Next Steps for Gen Ed.....	20

### Appendix A:

Evaluation of Program Review Rubric

### Appendix B:

*HPU Guide to Program Review*

### Appendix C:

WASC Standards Redline Version – 2001

### Appendix D:

Dr. Stephanie Schull's External Review Report (August 2)

## Part I: Introduction

The program review process at Hawaii Pacific University (HPU) has been evolving since our last WASC visit in 2005. With new WASC redlined standard revisions (completed February 2008) and recent updates made to the *Hawaii Pacific University Guide to Academic Program Review*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., (completed April 2011), an extensive exploration of the process used for program review at HPU was essential. This report is the result of an investigative evaluation of HPU's program review process in relationship to WASC standards. This report has provided valuable insight to HPU's program review practices that have worked, and/or need to be improved.

### Overview

The purpose of this report was to take a critical look at Hawaii Pacific University's program review process through the evaluation and analysis of eight existing program review reports. The programs that were randomly chosen for appraisal were: Advertising & Public Relations (ADPR – submitted January 2011); Diplomacy & Military Studies (DMS – submitted July 2009); History (HIST – submitted August 2010); Journalism (JOUR – submitted January 2011); Marine Science (MARS – submitted June 2011); Masters of Business Administration (MBA – submitted fall 2010); Psychology (PSYCH – submitted May 2010); and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL – submitted March 2011). Copies of the program review reports are attached as appendices.

Although some program review reports were more comprehensive than others, each included varying degrees of an analysis on: 1) program description and history; 2) program carrying capacity and sustainability; 3) faculty and student data; 4) student learning assessments, outcomes and plans; 5) program improvements; 6) program review results; and 7) recommendations and next steps.

To ensure that HPU adhered to the requirements indicated in the *WASC Handbook of Accreditation*, stating that:

*“Institutions are expected to analyze the effectiveness of the program review process, including its emphasis on the achievement of the program's learning outcomes. The process should be sufficiently embedded for the institution and the team to sample current program review reports (self-studies and external review reports) in order to assess the impact of the program review process and its alignment with the institution's quality improvement efforts and academic planning and budgeting.”*

as well as remain in compliance with the *WASC Core Commitments & Standards* (updated 02/08); specifically for both:

*“CFR 2.7 – all programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.”*

and

*“CFR 4.4 – the institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.”*

HPU conducted a comprehensive investigation of its program review process by using the standards, “good practices”, guidelines and rubrics provided by WASC as benchmarks, while comparing HPU’s program review methods and practices. In doing so, this allowed the review team to critically uncover areas for development and improvement.

### Review Team

The review team that completed this comprehensive analysis of the selected eight HPU program review reports were, Nancy Hedlund, Ph.D. (Associate Vice President of Planning & Assessment) and Malia Smith, Ed.D. (Assistant Dean for General Education). The Program Review & Learning Assessment External Review Report was completed by Stephanie Shull, Ph.D., who at the time of her submittal was the Assessment Coordinator of the Office of Academic Affairs and Assessment at Temple University (Dr. Shull has recently been hired - in August 2011 - as HPU’s Executive Director of the *Center for Advancement in Innovation and Technology*).

### Brief History of the HPU Program Review Guidelines

In August 2000, when the 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the *HPU Academic Program Review: A Guide to the Process at Hawaii Pacific University* was published, a discussion about a *planned change* was initiated where program reviews would be put into the “bigger picture” and aligned with the institution’s formal planning process. In order to do so, critical questions were posed (i.e.: “What should high-quality program reviews look like?” and “How should program review change to reflect that the process is maturing and the institution has achieved readiness to consider how to use program review results to enhance educational effectiveness?) to assist in directing the program review progress plan. Some of the suggestions for improvement were: strengthen the methods for assessment of learning and carrying capacity; develop program mission statements and goals; conduct annual self-reflective discussions to review the programs status; and assure on-going agenda revisions relative to internal and external challenges.

Initially, the program review process was based on a cyclical format, where data collection plans, analyses of learning outcomes, summary reports, external reviews and recommendation strategies were spread out over a five year period. Eight specific steps were defined to complete a program review, which included: Step 1) establishing the program review committee (PRC); Step 2) review of program learning objectives within context of program mission and goals; Step 3) development and approval of program review plan; Step 4) review and analysis of program strengths and needs for development and improvement; Step 5) preparation of final report; Step 6) external review, including revisions to final report; Step 7) “closing the evaluative loop” by addressing recommendations; and Step 8) continuing on-going program review. Although the course of action was clearly articulated, many of the detailed

outcomes, which were later outlined by WASC, called for a more demanding approach to the program review process.

A revised draft of the *Academic Program Review: A Guide to the Process at HPU* was developed in August 2009, and appeared to be more structured and comprehensive in comparison to the (August 2000) 4<sup>th</sup> edition. The draft provided clear guidelines for developing assessment plans/timelines, completing learning assessments, templates for program review annual reports, sample rating sheets and rubrics, learning assessment methodologies, follow-up plans, and an overview of the reporting requirements in program review portfolios. This draft was still being revised when some of the faculty used it as a guideline to complete their program review reports.

The final copy of the *HPU Guide to Academic Program Review, 5<sup>th</sup> edition* was completed in April 2011. It has been more streamlined with an inclusion of an analysis of academic rigor, budget implications/discussions, and future planning initiatives that require resources. (Through the revision process, the program capacity analysis was accidentally omitted and has since been reinstated in the guidelines). The eight steps that were defined in the 4<sup>th</sup> edition to complete a program review have been modified. Instead, the 5<sup>th</sup> edition provides “program review components and university good practices,” which publishes information related to program learning objectives/outcomes, program goals, curriculum mapping, learning assessment plans, reviews of online courses, annual program review planning reports, the comprehensive program review, external reviews, and follow-up meetings.

### Summary of the Program Review Process

The current program review process at HPU involves the implementation of a clearly defined methodology, an analysis of evidence-based reports, the examination of NSSE data results, and heavy faculty involvement and participation. According to the *HPU Guide to Academic Program Review, 5<sup>th</sup> edition* (April 2011) manual, the general process of a program review includes:

- continuous program and learning assessments (4 learning assessments per year – sampling different modalities and locations)
- completion of the annual program review/planning report
- submittal of a comprehensive program review (completed every 5-6 years to assess the overall program capacity and educational effectiveness)
- a comprehensive external review visit/report
- follow-up meeting(s) with Dean & Faculty to discuss findings and potential long-term plans and budgeting

The manual clearly defines the process and provides descriptions for each step; as well as templates for program learning assessment plans and timelines. Moreover, the *Annual Program Review & Planning Report Guide* (revised Fall 2010), which is included in the manual, offers instructions on completing the annual reports.

## **Part II: Analysis of HPU's Program Review Process**

### Summary of Program Review Reports

Advertising & Public Relations  
Diplomacy & Military Studies  
History  
Journalism  
Marine Science  
MBA  
Psychology  
Teaching English as Second Language

### Quality of Program Review Reports

Learning Assessments  
Program Use of Student Learning Outcomes  
External Review Reports  
Program Review Follow-Up Meetings

### S.W.O.T.

## **Part III: Evaluations**

### Comparisons & Contrasts: HPU Program Review Guidelines & WASC Guidelines

Alignment of HPU Program Review Model with WASC Best Practices

The Effectiveness of the HPU Program Review Process (using WASC rubrics)

## **Part IV: Recommendations/Next Steps**

### **Notes:**

- Curriculum & learning environment – have the program reviewed by external stakeholders (practitioners in the field, similar programs)
- Add comparisons to program curricula from other institutions
- Narrative that addresses various learning modalities and student learning preferences
- Report on alumni more extensively (placement of graduates in grad school, jobs acquired)
- Include Employer critiques of student performance
- Disciplinary ratings of the program
- Demographic breakdown of students by gender, ethnicity, age, GPA, etc

- Include more information about student support (orientation, non-cognitive variable of success - emotional, physical, psychological interventions, engagement in the campus community)
- Participation from the Deans need to be improved – prepare a detailed response to the program review that outline plans for implementing the recommendations or detailing reasons for not doing so
- Establish a Program Review committee that reviews all relevant documents (self-study reports, external reviews, departmental responses) to provide recommendations and action plans resulting from the evaluation process submitted by the department and Deans. This would provide a final report for action. A follow-up meeting would take place with the PRcommittee, administrators, Dean and VP of OAA to review the results after which goals are set, a timeline is developed and agreed upon resources are allocated for the execution of the plan.
- Provide a way to share the findings and results of the PR with stakeholder groups.
- Assist the programs to develop clearly defined degree objectives (perhaps using Lumina Framework)
- Use common language across all disciplines (some say program goals others say program objectives or degree objectives/ some say learning objectives others say learning outcomes. If the same language is used throughout the various programs, it will be easier to refer to each specific item when doing reviews of all the programs.
- 

### Ensuring Program Review Success

### Incorporating Results in HPU's Institutional Planning & Quality Assurance Systems

Based on WASC standards, a key element to ensuring institutional quality and improvements is the incorporation of program review analyses and evaluations. The purpose of program review is to improve the educational effectiveness of the university's academic programs. These reviews, which include evidence-based program operational evaluations, are designed to allow for specific programmatic input to be used during institutional planning and assessment efforts. According to WASC's Core Commitments and Standards:

*“CFR 4.6 – Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and uses the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.”*

Thus, HPU has attempted to incorporate the program review evaluations into institutional planning processes, but unfortunately has done so with limited success.

### Review of Learning Assessment Next Steps for Gen Ed

**Appendix A:**

Evaluation of Program Review Rubric

**Appendix B:**

*HPU Guide to Academic Program Review*, 4<sup>th</sup> (August 2000) & 5<sup>th</sup> editions (April 2011)

**Appendix C:**

WASC Standards Redline Version – 2001

**Appendix D:**

Dr. Stephanie Schull's External Review Report (August 20



### WASC & HPU Comparative Approaches to Evaluating Program Review Reports

WASC	HPU
<p>Step 1: Select PRs to review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 – 5 reports</li> </ul>	<p>Step 1: Selected PRs to Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 PRs (ADPR, DMS, HIST, JOURN, MARS, MBA, PSYCH, TESOL) were reviewed from 3 of the 4 colleges @ HPU (CHSS, Natural Sciences &amp; Business – currently the nursing program is going through their own specialized disciplinary licensing accreditation process to be completed November 2011)</li> </ul>
<p>Step 2: Hold pre-visit conference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet with faculty writing evaluation of the PR</li> <li>Explain methods/procedure</li> </ul>	<p>Step 2: Held Pre-Visit Conferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 meetings (June 3, 6, 8 &amp; 24, 2011) were held between Dr. Nancy Hedlund and Dr. Malia Smith to discuss methods and procedures for evaluation of the 8 program review reports</li> </ul>
<p>Step 3: Collect PR reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program self-reviews (including supporting documents/appendices)</li> <li>External evaluator reports</li> <li>Follow-up meeting/minutes</li> </ul>	<p>Step 3: Collected PR reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 self-review reports were provided and evaluated (including supporting documents/appendices)</li> <li>8 external evaluator reports were provided and evaluated</li> <li>Follow-up meetings (Aug. 3, 12 &amp; 25, 2011) between Nancy Hedlund and Malia Smith were conducted after the evaluation of the PRs were completed</li> </ul>
<p>Step 4: Conduct follow-up meeting with program faculty &amp; leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss the quality of the program using WASC rubrics</li> </ul>	<p>Step 4: Conduct follow-up meeting with program faculty &amp; leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WASC rubrics will be reviewed and used as benchmarks during these follow-up meetings, which still need to be scheduled</li> <li>Faculty and administrative leaders will be given the opportunity to peruse the <i>Review of the Program Review</i> report and provide feedback about the process and how the information can be used to improve their program review practices</li> </ul>
<p>Step 5: Discuss findings and use evidence to determine where the institution falls on the EE Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WASC EE rubric</li> </ul>	<p>Step 5: Discuss findings and use evidence to determine where the institution falls on the EE Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WASC EE rubric will be used as a guideline to examine and discuss the evidence-based findings provided by Dr. Hedlund and Dr. Smith</li> <li>Currently, HPU is going through a university strategic planning process and both Dr. Hedlund and Dr. Smith are on the taskforce to help analyze and develop strategies to assist in EE efforts at HPU and the WASC EE rubric is referenced</li> </ul>

\*This chart does not reflect quality – it only determines whether or not these items were included in the program review reports

<b>WASC “Good Practices” in Academic Program Review</b> (September 2009 guidelines) <u>Essential Features of a good PR</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence-based (qualitative &amp; quantitative)</li> <li>Assessment of student learning outcomes(SLO)</li> <li>Integration of results with planning , budgeting and institutional quality assurance systems (program/dept./college/institution)</li> </ul>	<b>HPU Academic Program Review Guide</b>  <u>Features included in 4<sup>th</sup> &amp; 5<sup>th</sup>ed.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence-based</li> <li>Assessment of SLO</li> <li>Integration of results with planning and budgeting and institutional quality assurance</li> </ul>	Program: ADPR College: CHSS	Program: DMS College: CHSS	Program: HIST College: CHSS	Program: JOURN College: CHSS	Program: MARS College: Natural Sciences	Program: MBA College: Business	Program: PSYCH College: CHSS	Program: TESOL College: CHSS	Total %
<b>Introduction</b>										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal/external context (program, college, degree concentrations, external influences)</li> </ul>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/8 = 100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief history of the program changes since last review</li> </ul>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/8 = 100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe program’s mission, goals, outcomes</li> </ul>	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	7/8 = 87.5%
<b>Analysis of Evidence about Program Quality/Sustainability (Evidence addresses program quality)</b>										
- Addresses questions about students	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/8 = 100%
- The curriculum learning environment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/8 = 100%
- Student learning success	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	7/8 = 87.5%
- Curriculum maps	X		X	X				X		3/8 = 37.5%
- Institutional comparisons										0/8 = 0%
- Measures of teaching effectiveness (evaluations, scholarship, pedagogy)	X		X	X		X			X	4/8 = 50%

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]



# Rubric Guide Used to Analyze HPU's Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews (Institutional-level)

**0 = Initial      1 = Emerging      2 = Developed      3 = Highly Developed**

\*The WASC rubric for “*Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews*” was used as a benchmarking tool for this evaluation process.

WASC Criterion	Rate 0-4	Comments:
1. <u>Required Elements of the Self-Study</u> : Evidence of faculty evaluating the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, results, changes, impact of the changes and a plan for the next assessment cycle	2	A plan for the next cycle of assessment studies needs to be included to ensure that an ongoing process of self-evaluation is incorporated as a basic practice in each program.
2. <u>Process of Review</u> : Qualified internal and external reviewers evaluated the program's learning outcomes, plan, results and assessment impacts. Feedback and suggestions for improvement of student learning are provided	3	Highly qualified external reviewers, as well as discipline specific faculty members participated (and continue to participate) in the program review process. Evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement were provided and this information should be used as a guide to explore and improve student learning.
3. <u>Planning &amp; Budgeting</u> : Evidence that the institution integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes	1	The “old” administration had placed budget constraints upon program development efforts, which often frustrated the faculty who participated in learning assessment and program review and wanted to use the information to guide their next steps in program development. Currently, the university is under new leadership and it is anticipated that the program reviews will eventually be integrated into the planning and budgeting process on the departmental, college and institutional levels.
4. <u>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</u> : A qualified individual or committee provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, plans, results and assessment impact. Follow-up actions to improve student learning is supported by the department and institution	2	<p>Although the efforts of our qualified program review leader (Dr. Nancy Hedlund) provided annual and on-going feedback on the quality of assessment planning, studies and results, the influence of the “old” administration and their lack of interest in the purpose of program review impeded her from enjoying institutional support in the program review and learning assessment process.</p> <p>Many departments did not follow-up or take action in improving their student learning by using program reviews, because in the past it was not an important part of the culture at this institution (due to lack of interest among “old” administrators).</p>
5. <u>The Student Experience</u> : Students are partners in the program review process. Students participate in program review by sharing how they use and apply rubrics to self-assess and provide their own evaluative feedback	3	Students have been invited and encouraged to provide input related to student learning. Internal and external reviewers have conducted focus groups and surveys to gather student perspectives. Sample work, portfolios and capstone projects have been reviewed by internal and external reviewers. Students have been asked what they learned and how they learned it, but rarely are they asked to do poster sessions on their work.
Mean Average:	2.2	Based on this specific WASC rubric, the integration of student learning assessments into program reviews at HPU is developed; and efforts will be made (particularly to the integration of program review with planning and budgeting) as we strive to become highly developed.

## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Combined Rating for All 8 Program Reviews</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review)	2.63	
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	2.25	
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	2.75	It appears that this is a near highly-developed section, as most of the programs were able to provide in-depth analyses on faculty data .
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	2.37	
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	2.0	This capacity analysis related to quality of curriculum and teaching could be improved. An inclusion of a curriculum map should be added to each report, as well as a better discussion on high-impact learning strategies, which could assist the program in analyzing best practices in the classroom and throughout the curriculum.
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	2.12	
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	2.37	It appears that the learning assessments provided in the overall program review reports were “developed”. However, there is room for improvement and a more simplified process would be beneficial. Also, the criteria rating sheets used by the programs to assess student samples should include descriptors rather than just relying on numeric ratings.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	2.12	
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	2.0	This area could be developed more.
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	1.75	This is an area that needs more attention, and should be incorporated into each program review report. Perhaps this lends to the idea that programs have not yet utilized program reviews for future planning, goal setting and budget decisions.
7. Appendices (as needed)	2.25	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	2.75	
Mean Average:	2.28	Based on the mean average, the overall combined program review reports received a 2.28, which indicates that the program review reports are generally “developed,” but still have limitations that do not necessarily address important matters related to the program and student learning. The reporting of data appears quite thorough however; using the data to develop thoughtful recommendations is minimal. It is necessary to ensure that faculty understands that these program reviews are integral parts of the planning process for their programs.



## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

Program: <b>ADPR</b>	Rate 0-3	Comments:
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review)	3	
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	1	The Program Review Comprehensive Report Format – 5year Report Guide was used as a guideline for the writer of this report; unfortunately the capacity segment was missing in the document, so the writer failed to include this information. However, the guide has since been revised and updated.
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	2	The NSSE results were used to look at faculty data and their relationship to student engagement.
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	3	
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	1	
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	1	More information on staff support needs and a reflection on the needed institutional resources that assist in learning should be incorporated. It was briefly reviewed in the annual program review reports, but not in the 5-year program review report.
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	2	Although the analysis of the learning assessment outcomes had limitations, the supporting learning assessment data included in the appendix was very comprehensive and displayed quality work in analyzing the learning outcomes and program objectives.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	3	
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	3	Easy to read and thoughtful analysis
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	1	Limited discussion on long-term implementation of plans and required resources for progress were included.
7. Appendices (as needed)	2	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	A highly qualified external reviewer with many years of experience in the field/industry provided an excellent report with sound recommendations for program improvement.
Mean Average:	2.08	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 2.08; which indicates that it is a “developed” review that still has some limitations and lacks to address important matters related to the program and student learning. A more thorough capacity discussion was needed.

## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Program: DMS</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review, etc.)	3	Thorough discussion on history of the program and development of the DMS program.
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	3	
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	3	Thorough discussion on faculty interests and faculty development.
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	3	Good discussion on diversity of students and enrollment.
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	3	Full discussion of internships, off-campus opportunities, capstone experiences and concurrent programs. Also, good in-depth analysis of the curriculum changes made over time.
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	3	
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	3	Included learning assessment results and an overview of how it will be used and potentially integrated into campus level assessments.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	3	
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	1	
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	2	Fair discussion on future plans. However, the short and long-term goals were not tied to budget allocation projections.
7. Appendices	3	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	Expressed that program review should be streamlined and perhaps the program objectives should emphasize practical skills like critical thinking, writing and reading comprehension. Qualified external reviewer was used.
Mean Average:	2.75	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 2.75; which indicates that it is a “developed” review that still has some limitations and lacks to address important matters related to the program and student learning. Nevertheless, it is a good report that lends valuable insight to the programs status and progress.

## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Program: History</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review, etc.)	3	Discussion on the history of the program was thorough and presented issues particularly related to Gen Ed and offered supportive evidence of current status. Long discussion on revisions since last program review, but it would have been a good idea to present the old program to allow for comparisons and be drawn.
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	3	
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	3	Thorough discussion regarding faculty (support, recruiting, workload, adjunct to full-time ratio, community service, etc.)
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	3	Good breakdown of student residency and diversity. Also, good references to alumni and student retention.
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	3	Clear and easy to understand curriculum map was provided and explained.
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	3	Thorough discussion on the instructional resources available and the lack thereof.
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	3	An indirect and direct assessment analysis was included. However, a light discussion was provided comparing modalities, but thorough data was provided in the appendix.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	3	
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	1	Not presented as an easy reference
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	2	Emerging discussion, however, there was no emphasis on designing improvements that can only be addressed with resources.
7. Appendices	3	Extensive inclusion of documents (faculty data, learning assessments, results of 2008 program review, enrollment data, proposal for the MA in World History).
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	Heavy discussion was related to the current Gen Ed program and its impact upon the history department. The external reviewer appeared to be very knowledgeable in this field and critical of workload, learning assessment and program review responsibilities placed upon faculty.
Mean Average:	2.75	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 2.75; which indicates that it is a “developed” review that still has some limitations and lacks to address important matters related to the program and student learning, particularly related to budget allocations for future planning.

## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Program: JOURNALISM</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review, etc.)	3	
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	1	This section was missing because the writer used the revised program review guidelines to finish the report and the carrying capacity description was missing (but has since been added to the newest version of the guidelines). However, the report does include the annual program reviews, which include discussions about the program's carrying capacity.
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	2	
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	3	A thorough discussion using NSSE results and student enrollment counts were used to address the sustainability of the program.
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	1	Minimal discussion was presented. However, it was included in the annual program review reports.
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	1	
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	3	A discussion on location, modality, distance learning, capstone courses, writing requirements, information literacy and syllabus review lent to a comprehensive overview of how student learning was/is approached in this program.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	3	A thorough discussion about the changes made since the last program review was covered.
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	3	Extensive and easy to reference SWOT analysis was included.
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	1	Limited discussion - did not include future projections or ideas and what resources would be necessary to accomplish short and long-term goals.
7. Appendices	2	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	Highly-qualified external reviewer offered feedback that challenged the faculty to explore various ideas about how to improve and expand the journalism program at HPU.
Mean Average:	2.16	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 2.16; which indicates that it is a "developed" review that still has some limitations and lacks to address important matters related to the program and student learning. This program review mainly lacked an analysis on faculty data and the quality of the curriculum, which is an important part in analyzing the overall program. However, in utilizing the annual program review reports, it is apparent that this program has assessed its progress using evidence.

# Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

Program: <b>MARS</b>	Rate 0-3	Comments:
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review, etc.)	2	Limited discussion on how recent changes affected the program. Does not include the mission of the program.
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	3	Extensive and thorough explanation of program capacity.
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	3	Heavy attention place on a discussion about faculty workload, but thorough in analyzing faculty data.
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	0	Lacked a discussion regarding students (enrollments and issues)
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	2	Good in-depth analysis of curriculum, but did not include a curriculum map.
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	3	Thorough discussion of the current resources available (and the lack thereof) for the program. Special emphasis was placed upon a discussion about the external learning resources including Kaholo, labs and the Oceanic Institute.
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	2	Fair discussion on some of the results, but limited solutions was included. There was some discussion on how to improve and address issues but no references to online or MCP. Analyzed all six program objectives using same samples from 2008-2010. Learning assessment criteria was too general.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	1	Very limited discussion.
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	0	Not included
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	1	There was no vision presented for the future of this program – need a strategic plan to map the vision so that it reflects the excellence of the space, environment, faculty, etc.
7. Appendices	2	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	1	The external review was only 2-pages and had a very limited discussion on learning assessments and student learning. It mainly emphasized the curriculum and faculty research and lab expansions.
Mean Average:	1.66	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 1.66; which indicates that it is an “emerging” review that has many limitations and is missing important information related to the program and student learning. Nevertheless, the program review report has provided some data that can be used to help the program to make necessary improvements.

## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Program: MBA</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review)	1	Mission is included but there is no discussion on the history of the program or references to the last review.
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	2	
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	3	Good discussion on the quality indicators and faculty workload.
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	2	Light discussion
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	2	Incorporated student surveys (primary research) and included a thorough discussion on the capstone experience.
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	2	Thorough analysis of the various learning resources including classroom, library, tutoring services, computer center and advising center.
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	2	A good explanation of the assessment process, including a timeline and plan was provided; however, similar samples were not used for the learning assessment analysis and the learning assessments were incomplete. No criteria rating sheets were attached to the assessments.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	1	Limited discussion
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	3	
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	3	Curricula recommendations were provided based on student/faculty survey. Recommendations for each section were integrated throughout the entire report.
7. Appendices (as needed)	3	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	Reflects an honest assessment of the current conditions of the curriculum and capacity for the MBA program. Reviewer explains there is no tracking system that determines the student success of those who were admitted based on the GMAT test scores compared to those that didn't take it. Suggested that the program should assess the concentration courses and syllabi – especially for distance learning courses.
Mean Average:	2.25	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 2.25; which indicates that it is a “developed” review that still has some limitations and lacks to address important matters related to the program and student learning. This program should work on developing their learning assessments and how they gather, conduct and measure their data.

# Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Program: PSYCHOLOGY</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review)	3	Thorough description of the history of the program and the impacts that the changes have made.
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	2	
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	3	Good discussion of the faculty and their role in the programs' status.
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	2	Provides data, but there is no indication of where it came from or specifically what it means or how it impacts the program.
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	2	
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	1	
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	1	Limited discussion that did not include a timeline or learning assessment plan.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	0	There was an analysis of what the program is currently doing, but there was no discussion or evidence provided on any changes and impacts upon the program.
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	2	
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	1	A light discussion of strengths and weaknesses were provided, but no future recommendations or references for needed resources were included.
7. Appendices	0	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	The external reviewer provided good suggestions and recommendations, particularly about the assessment process and requirements that the program should adopt.
Mean Average:	1.66	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 1.66; which indicates that it is an "emerging" review that has many limitations and is missing important information related to the program and student learning. Nevertheless, the program review report has provided some data that can be used as a guide to help the program make necessary changes.



## Rubric Guide for Reviewing the Content of the Program Review Report

**0 = no attention to this area (needs improvement/initial)**

**1 = limited attention to this area (emerging)**

**2 = area addressed but still with some limitations (developed)**

**3 = area very well addressed (highly developed)**

<b>Program: TESOL</b>	<b>Rate 0-3</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
1. Program description and history (program description, mission statement, history, last review	3	Thorough analysis that includes a review of their old recommendations, which exemplifies continuity within the program.
2. Program carrying capacity and sustainability - overall integrative analysis	3	Thoughtful review of the program carrying capacity particularly related to the recruiting process was provided.
a. Faculty data and analyses for adequacy of faculty	3	Comprehensive discussion on faculty interests, workload, governance, service, etc. was included.
b. Student data and analyses for sustainability of enrollment	3	
c. Quality of curriculum and teaching including curriculum map; extent of use of high-impact learning strategies	2	A thorough discussion of the curriculum and its relationship to academic rigor, learning experiences and teaching were provided; however, no curriculum map was presented
d. Adequacy of learning resources for curriculum (now and future)	3	A comprehensive discussion about the learning resources was included; particularly related to student services.
3. Analysis of student learning. Results of learning assessments; includes assessment plan and timeline	3	Good learning assessments/rubrics.
4. Major program improvements made since last review and evidence concerning the impact of these changes	3	In-depth analysis of the program improvements and adjustments made to the program since the last review. Discussion about how the former program review was used was also included.
5. Overall SWOT analysis of the program	3	Immediate and long-term recommendations were included. The results from a survey that the external reviewer disseminated to students and faculty were also in the report.
6. Analysis of recommendations and future plans	3	An integration of recommendations were added throughout the program review, as well as presented in the recommendation summary. Also, the report included "actions to be taken" that spoke to short and long-term planning and goal setting.
7. Appendices (as needed)	3	
8. Comprehensive external review report included	3	Thorough report that gave sound recommendations that addressed the needs of the program. The external reviewer also included a faculty response section, which documented the evaluative process.
Mean Average:	2.91	Based on the mean average, this program review report received a 2.91; which indicates that it is a "developed" review that still has some limitations and lacks to address important matters related to the program and student learning. However, this report was very well written and included a comprehensive analysis that will provide valuable information to guide the development of the program. It is one of the most developed program review reports submitted.