Spring 2026

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE

SOUTH GEORGIA STATE COLLEGE

Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Planning

DIVISION OF ACADEMIC & STUDENT AFFAIRS

Contents

Part I: Comprehensive Program Review Process – An Overview

Purpose and Context

This guide provides a comprehensive overview of the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) process and reflects the evolution of CPR practices over time.

The guide outlines key expectations, timelines, responsibilities, and resources to support academic programs in conducting meaningful self-assessment. It also includes practical examples, model templates, and guiding questions to help departments produce high-quality program reviews that are both reflective and actionable.

SGSC's approach to Comprehensive Program Review has evolved from a primarily compliance-driven reporting exercise to a more integrated, evidence-based process for continuous improvement. The original 2016 University System of Georgia CPR reporting vehicle provided a strong foundation by standardizing indicators of quality, productivity, and viability across institutions and by defining common metrics such as time to degree, enrollment patterns, faculty characteristics, and degrees awarded. While that template ensured alignment with Board of Regents policy and supported system-level accountability, it offered limited guidance on how programs should interpret the data, engage faculty in analysis, or translate findings into concrete action plans.

The current Comprehensive Program Review Guide builds directly on that framework but shifts the emphasis from filling out forms to constructing a thoughtful, question-driven self-study that is closely aligned with SGSC's mission, strategic priorities, and assessment practices. It introduces clearer expectations for narrative analysis, integrates role-specific guidance for department chairs, faculty, deans, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Planning (IEP), and embeds model examples, checklists, and rubrics to support consistent, high-quality reviews. In this way, the updated CPR process retains the core USG criteria and metrics while providing a more robust, user-friendly structure that helps programs use evidence not only to document their current status but also to plan, implement, and monitor meaningful improvements over the review cycle.

What is Comprehensive Program Review (CPR)?

The CPR is a structured, evidence-based process that supports the continuous improvement of academic programs. It ensures that programs maintain high quality, remain productive, and demonstrate viability. The review combines quantitative and qualitative data with faculty reflection to produce a comprehensive assessment of each program. While the process culminates in a formal self-study at the end of the review cycle, programs should engage in ongoing assessment and improvement throughout the cycle.

Core Assessment Criteria

Programs are reviewed according to three dimensions:

Quality refers to the relevance of the curriculum, the effectiveness of teaching, and the evidence of student learning outcomes.
Productivity focuses on measurable factors such as enrollment trends, retention and graduation rates, and the efficiency of faculty and resource use.
Viability considers the external environment, including market demand, competitive positioning, and potential for program growth.
Together, these three criteria ensure that programs are assessed holistically and that the results inform both immediate improvements and long-term planning.

Complete CPR Structure

The CPR submission consists of three core components:

- **Program Self-Study:** completed by program faculty; includes embedded data tables and faculty/enrollment information
- **Dean's Memorandum:** school-level assessment and recommendations
- **Provost & VPAA Summary Statement:** institutional determination and expectations

This guidebook is organized into five parts (Parts I–V). Together, they provide process overviews, step-by-step instructions, examples, templates, and support tools to help programs complete each of the three CPR components thoroughly and effectively.

How to Use This Guide

Each section of this guide includes:

- Process guidance and context drawn from the CPR framework developed by the University System of Georgia
- Guiding questions to support reflection and analysis
- Model samples that demonstrate effective approaches
- Annotated examples that explain why those approaches work
- Before-and-after comparisons that highlight specific improvements
- Templates and checklists for practical application
- Common pitfalls to watch for and strategies to avoid them

Working through these elements will help programs clearly understand expectations and consistently produce excellent work.

Typical Timeline and Responsibilities

The CPR follows a standardized annual cycle designed to provide programs with adequate time for reflection, analysis, revision, and review. The following timeline represents the CPR schedule for all programs:

Milestone	Description	Date	Responsible Party
Data Package Released	Distribute CPR support data and program information to the dean/department chair.	15-Oct	Institutional Research → Dean/Department Chair
Data Review Period	Review CPR data with department faculty and identify findings/needs.	Nov–Feb	Department Chair & Faculty
Data Requests Due	Submit CPR data questions and additional information requests to the IEP.	15-Dec	Department Chair → IEP
Draft Self-Study Due	Submit draft self-study and supporting documents to IEP for preliminary review.	1-Mar	Department Chair → IEP
IEP Feedback Returned	Provide feedback to the department chair for revision and completion.	15-Mar	IEP → Department Chair
Final Self-Study Due (Dean)	Submit the final self-study to the school dean for review and approval.	1-May	Department Chair → Dean
Final Package Compiled	Compile complete CPR package (self-study + dean memo).	15-May	IEP (after dean memo submitted)
Provost/VPAA Review & Approval	Forward the final CPR package to Provost & VPAA for review and final approval.	1-Jun	IEP → VPAA

Part II: Guidance for Stakeholders

Guidance for Department Chairs

Department chairs lead the preparation of self-study and serve as facilitators of faculty dialogue. Their task is to ensure that self-study is thorough, evidence-based, and reflective of faculty input and program realities.
Chairs should convene regular meetings with program faculty to work through each section of the template, using data from the IEP as the primary starting point for analysis. The aim is to interpret these data to generate meaningful insights into program quality, student success, and strategic direction. Chairs are also responsible for balancing program advocacy with alignment to institutional goals. A strong self-study is candid about challenges, sets realistic, measurable goals, and clearly links its recommendations to both program needs and institutional priorities. Chairs should prepare their faculty for revisions following IEP feedback, framing this step as an opportunity to refine and strengthen the report. When approached in this way, the chair's leadership transforms the CPR into a meaningful process of reflection and planning, producing a narrative that accurately represents the program's current state and future aspirations.

Guidance for Faculty

Faculty play a significant role in the CPR process. As the individuals closest to the curriculum, students, and day-to-day program operations, they provide essential insights that shape the quality and accuracy of the self-study. Faculty should:

- Engage actively in discussions about program strengths, challenges, and opportunities
- Provide examples and evidence from their teaching, scholarship, and service
- Contribute to the interpretation of data and identification of meaningful trends
- Help develop plans that are realistic and clearly focused on improving student success
- Review drafts of the self-study to ensure accuracy, completeness, and clarity

The CPR is most effective when it reflects authentic faculty collaboration and a shared sense of ownership over the program's future direction.

Guidance for Deans

Deans play a crucial role in the CPR by providing an independent and strategic perspective. Their evaluation complements the self-study by situating each program within the school's portfolio and SGSC's broader academic mission.

The most effective dean's reviews are specific and actionable. Rather than restating what programs already know, deans should identify opportunities for innovation, highlight resource considerations, and provide guidance on aligning program goals with school-level priorities. By taking this approach, deans contribute to the strategic use of the CPR to align school-level goals with institutional priorities.

Guidance for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Planning

The IEP serves as the administrative coordinator and technical support provider for the CPR process. IEP responsibilities include:

- Preparing individualized, pre-populated templates with program-specific quantitative data
- Providing guidance on data interpretation and analysis
- Conducting preliminary reviews and offering constructive feedback
- Compiling final CPR packages for submission to the Office of Academic Affairs
- Serving as a resource for questions throughout the process

IEP establishes clear communication channels and is responsive to department needs while maintaining consistency and quality standards across all program reviews.

Important Update on Roles and Workflow

The responsibilities and support levels described in this section reflect the current CPR process. If institutional workflows, data systems, or submission processes evolve, this section will be updated accordingly. Programs should follow the most current procedures communicated by the IEP each fall.

To support clarity, all tables referenced in the self-study (e.g., Student Attributes, Faculty Productivity) will be provided directly by IEP along with a sample format to guide interpretation.

Part III: The Self-Study Template

The self-study template is the primary document through which programs demonstrate their quality, productivity, and viability. It builds on the December 2016 CPR reporting vehicle, which established a common structure and metrics framework across the University System of Georgia, and extends that foundation to focus more intentionally on program-level analysis and improvement. This updated version emphasizes a more explicit Quality–Viability–Productivity framework, a question-driven structure to guide analytical thinking, closer integration with institutional strategic planning, and dedicated attention to faculty development and stakeholder engagement.

Part III provides detailed guidance, guiding questions, and model examples for completing each component of the template so that programs can produce a clear, evidence-based, and improvement-focused self-study.

Data Sources and Systems Used in CPR

All data used in the CPR, including enrollment trends, productivity metrics, faculty indicators, and student learning outcomes, will be drawn from SGSC's official data systems. Most of the data is also available in the USG Academic Data Commons and is included in the CPR tables, aligned with the same criteria. If the institution adopts new reporting platforms, new learning outcome frameworks, or revised assessment cycles, the self-study expectations will align with those updated systems. Programs should always use the most recent IEP data and refer to updated documentation at each review cycle.

IEP will provide all required tables and supporting data files. Programs should not recreate or modify official metrics unless explicitly instructed to do so. IEP is also available to supply additional data upon request to support a program's self-study.

Template Expectation (2026):
Throughout the self-study, explicitly cite and interpret referenced tables, connect evidence to conclusions, and support all claims with quantitative and/or qualitative evidence (e.g., assessment results, survey findings, advising or curriculum artifacts, employer or advisory feedback, or other concrete examples). Action plans should include responsible parties, timelines, baseline measures, target outcomes, and how progress will be assessed.

If a required data element is unavailable, note the gap, explain the likely cause, and describe how and when it will be addressed. Assessment examples in this guide reflect standard practices, but programs should adapt them to align with the institution’s current assessment framework, including established Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), updated rubrics or proficiency scales, revised assessment reporting platforms, and any changes in the review cycle or evidence requirements.

Academic Program Information

Begin by completing the basic program information section:

- Submitter:
- Program Name:
- Department:
- School:
- Program Coordinator(s):
- Primary Contact Email:
- Review Period:
- Report Academic Year:
- Delivery Mode(s):
- Campus/Location:

Section 1: Program Mission and Purpose

Instructions: Describe your program's core purpose, educational or service goals, and objectives.

Questions:

- How does your program align with and contribute to SGSC's mission, core values, and strategic direction?
- What unique features or strengths does your program offer?
- What are the program's core educational goals and measurable objectives?

Sample Mission Statements

Professional Program (Business Administration)

The Bachelor of Business Administration program prepares students for dynamic careers in business through rigorous coursework in accounting, finance, management, and marketing. Aligned with the university's mission to advance social mobility, the program emphasizes experiential learning, ethical decision-making, and global business practices. Graduates are equipped to excel in corporate settings, entrepreneurial ventures, and graduate study.

Lab-Based STEM Program (Biological Sciences)

The Biological Sciences program cultivates scientific inquiry and prepares students for careers in healthcare, research, and environmental science. Through laboratory investigation, field research, and collaborative projects, students develop analytical skills and content mastery essential for medical school, graduate programs, and science professions. The program aligns with the university's commitment to undergraduate research and community engagement.

Humanities Program (English Literature)

The English Literature program develops critical reading, analytical thinking, and sophisticated communication skills through the study of diverse literary traditions.

Students engage with texts that illuminate human experience across cultures and time periods, preparing them for careers in education, publishing, law, and professional writing. The program advances the university's liberal arts mission and commitment to cultural understanding.

Mission Statement Checklist

Effective mission statements should address the following key elements:

- Clearly identifies the degree level and program focus
- Describes what students learn and how they develop
- Connects program goals to institutional mission
- Identifies career pathways or graduate school preparation
- Demonstrates awareness of community or regional needs
- Uses clear, jargon-free language

Before vs. After: Improving Alignment

BEFORE (Weak alignment)

The Psychology program instructs students about human behavior and mental processes. Students take courses in various areas of psychology and can choose electives based on their interests.

Why this is weak: Generic description, no institutional connection, unclear outcomes, no career focus.

AFTER (Strong alignment)

The Psychology program develops evidence-based understanding of human behavior, cognition, and development, preparing students for graduate study leading to careers in mental health, human services, and research. Through coursework in clinical, developmental, and social psychology, students gain practical skills valued in regional healthcare and social service sectors. The program supports the university's commitment to community well-being and student career readiness.

Why this is strong: Specific outcomes, institutional connection, career pathways identified, community focus, clear value proposition.

Section 2: Student Development and Program Productivity

Instructions: Analyze student attributes at program entry and exit and evaluate internal productivity metrics. Focus on what the data reveals about your program's effectiveness in developing students and maintaining sustainable enrollment patterns.

Section 2A: Student Development Analysis

Tables 1A and 1B: Student Attributes (Entry and Exit)

Five-year trend analysis of student attributes from admission to graduation, including academic performance, demographic diversity, and post-graduation outcomes.

Questions:

- Based on the data in Tables 1A and 1B (Student Attributes at Entry and Exit), what value does the program add to students' academic and career development between entry and exit? What specific changes in student attributes demonstrate program effectiveness?
- What areas show the greatest opportunity for improvement in student development outcomes?

Model Student Development Analysis

(Use this as a structure: thesis → key trend evidence → interpretation → implications → next steps.)

Effective analysis example (model structure):

Over the five-year review period, student outcomes suggest improved academic development and stronger post-graduation placement, indicating positive program value-added. While entering student preparation remained stable, exit indicators show gains in major GPA and first-destination outcomes. The program's advising and course-sequencing changes appear to support student momentum and completion. The most significant opportunity for improvement is strengthening post-graduation survey response rates so that career outcomes are captured more consistently and used to guide improvement planning.

Effective Analysis Phrases

- "The most notable trend across the review period is…"
- "This pattern suggests…"
- "One plausible explanation is…"
- "These results are consistent with…"
- "The data indicate strengths in…, while highlighting opportunities in…"
- "To address this, the program will…"

Section 2B: Internal Productivity Analysis

Table 2: Program Productivity Indicators

Internal productivity metrics, including enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation patterns.

Questions:

- Based on Table 2 (Program Productivity Indicators), how does the program evaluate its productivity in terms of enrollment stability, retention rates, progression patterns, and graduation outcomes? What trends indicate program strengths or areas needing improvement?
- Has the University System Office flagged the program for low enrollment or low degree production? If so, what specific actions have been taken in response, and what have been the results?
- How does your program compare to institutional benchmarks, peer programs, or national averages for retention and graduation rates?

Model Trend Analysis

Effective trend interpretation (example):

Although enrollment declined modestly over five years, retention and graduation outcomes improved, suggesting the program is enrolling students with stronger program fit and supporting them more effectively through completion. Four-year graduation rates increased while retention strengthened, which aligns with program actions to address advising, prerequisite sequencing, and early academic momentum. Next-cycle priorities will focus on stabilizing enrollment without sacrificing student success gains by strengthening recruitment pathways and communications strategies.

Sample Response: Low-Producing Program (if applicable)

If the program has been flagged for low enrollment or low degree production, address it directly using:

- What the flag is and when it occurred
- What the program did (specific actions)
- What changed (results)
- What comes next (targets and timelines)

Section 3: Curriculum, Learning Outcomes, and Assessment

Instructions: Describe the structure and coherence of the curriculum and how it supports student achievement of program learning outcomes. Summarize key assessment findings from the review period and explain how evidence has been used to improve curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning ("closing the loop"). Reference relevant data tables and assessment artifacts where applicable.

Questions:
Curriculum structure and sequencing

- How is the curriculum structured and sequenced to support progression toward program learning outcomes?
    - In your response, describe:
        - The overall curriculum map (e.g., which courses are introductory, developing, or advanced for each program learning outcome).
        - How required and elective courses build toward the capstone or other culminating experiences.
        - Any identified bottlenecks, redundancies, or misalignments in course sequencing and how they affect student progression.

Evidence-driven programmatic and curricular changes

- What programmatic or curricular changes have been implemented (or are planned) in response to assessment and other evidence (e.g., student performance, survey data, advisory board feedback)?
    - In your response, describe:
        - The specific evidence that prompted each change.
        - The nature of the change (e.g., new course, revised prerequisite, redesigned assignment, change in modality or sequencing).
        - How you will determine whether each change improves student learning outcomes, including the measures and success criteria you will use.

Assessment Analysis Checklist

A strong assessment narrative typically includes:

- PLO(s) assessed and where/when assessed
- Evidence summary (results and trends)
- Interpretation (what it means and why)
- Action taken ("closing the loop")
- Plan to evaluate impact (measure + target + timeline)

Section 4: Faculty Capacity and Professional Development

Instructions: Evaluate whether faculty capacity, qualifications, and professional development are sufficient to deliver the curriculum and support the program's priorities. Focus on staffing adequacy, faculty expertise, stability, and development needs that directly affect instruction, advising, student mentoring, and implementation of improvements identified in Section 3.

Table 3: Indicators of Faculty Qualifications and Productivity

Key indicators include terminal-degree percentages, tenure ratios, rank distributions, and related staffing context.

Questions:

- Based on Table 3 (Faculty Qualifications and Productivity), assess whether the program has adequate faculty capacity and appropriate expertise to deliver the curriculum and meet student needs. What strengths and gaps does the data reveal (e.g., rank mix, tenure/NTT balance, terminal degree levels, use of part-time faculty)?
- What professional development opportunities, mentoring initiatives, and support structures are in place for faculty across all ranks/tracks? How do these supports strengthen teaching effectiveness, student support, and implementation of program improvements?
- What faculty-related priorities will you pursue in the next review cycle (e.g., hiring strategy, workload adjustments, mentoring, training, succession planning)? Include timelines, responsible parties, and how you will assess progress.

Model Faculty Capacity Summary

The program's faculty capacity and expertise are sufficient to deliver core curriculum requirements; however, the distribution of expertise and workload indicates specific gaps that affect the implementation of program priorities. Table 3 shows strengths in faculty qualifications and instructional stability, while also highlighting areas for improvement in rank mix and reliance on part-time instruction in key courses. The program will prioritize targeted professional development and, where feasible, hiring/workload adjustments aligned to the curriculum and assessment changes described in Section 3.

Acknowledging Challenges Constructively

Weak approach (defensive)
Faculty lack adequate research support, and teaching loads are too high for scholarly productivity.

Strong approach (constructive)
Limited conference travel funding has constrained dissemination opportunities; the program has adapted through virtual presentations and is seeking additional development support.

Section 5: Resource Adequacy and Support

Instructions: Evaluate the adequacy of resources and support structures that enable your program to achieve its mission and objectives. Address both current resource levels and anticipated needs.

Questions:

- Assess the adequacy of the program's budget and funding. What trends have you observed over the past five years, and how have budget changes affected program quality and capacity?

- Evaluate the adequacy of facilities, laboratories, specialized equipment, and learning spaces for your program. What facility improvements or additions would enhance student learning and program effectiveness?
- Assess the adequacy of technology infrastructure, software, instructional resources, and library collections. How well do current technology resources support teaching, learning, and research/creative activities?
- Evaluate administrative and staff support for the program, including advising, administrative assistance, and technical support. Are current support levels adequate for programming needs?
- What are your highest-priority resource needs for the next review cycle? How would addressing these needs improve program quality and student outcomes?

Model Resource Adequacy Paragraph

Facilities and instructional technology are currently sufficient for baseline delivery of the curriculum, but resource constraints limit the program's ability to scale high-impact learning experiences and fully implement next-cycle improvements. Over the review period, budget patterns have supported essential operations but have restricted upgrades to specialized equipment and software. The highest priority needs for the next cycle include targeted technology/software support and enhanced staff capacity for advising and administrative coordination. Addressing these needs would directly support student progression, learning outcomes, and timely completion by reducing bottlenecks and strengthening implementation of the curriculum and assessment improvements described in Sections 2–3.

Making Resource Requests "Decision-Ready"

For each priority need, include:

- What is needed (specific)
- Why it matters (evidence-based impact)
- Who is responsible (request owner)
- Timeline (when needed)
- Success measure (how you will know it helped)

Section 6: Program Viability and Strategic Positioning

Instructions: Evaluate the program's viability by analyzing (1) student demand for the program and (2) external demand for the program's graduates. Use Table 4 to interpret student demand trends. In addition to internal outcome indicators in Table 1B, incorporate at least two external sources of demand evidence (e.g., employer/advisory board input, internship/placement partner feedback, licensure/credentialing bodies, labor market data, transfer pathway data, competitor/program scans, regional workforce reports). Use this evidence to identify strengths, risks, and strategies to sustain or grow the program.

Table 4: Program Viability Indicators

These indicators summarize student demand and program sustainability across the review period, including recruitment and entry points (from applications to enrollment), declaration timing, and reliance on cross-departmental instructional support.

Questions:

- Based on Table 4 (Program Viability Indicators), what do the trends suggest about student demand (e.g., applications, admits, yield, and declaration patterns)? Identify strengths, risks, and any notable shifts over the review period.
- Beyond the internal outcomes reported in Table 1B, what evidence indicates external demand for graduates (e.g., employer/advisory input, internship/placement partner feedback, licensure/credentialing outcomes where applicable, labor market data, alumni outcomes)? What are the implications for program positioning, partnerships, recruitment, or curriculum emphasis (without repeating Section 3's assessment narrative)?
- What specific strategies will the program implement to strengthen viability (e.g., recruitment pathways, partnerships, marketing/communications, advising improvements, internship pipelines, modality changes)? Include responsible parties, timelines, and how success will be measured.

Data Sources for Viability Analysis (Examples)

- Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook Handbook
- State labor market projections
- Advisory board/employer feedback
- Internship/placement partner feedback
- Graduate employment surveys (6-month and 1-year)
- Alumni career trajectory data
- Competitor/program scans
- Regional economic development reports

Section 7: Executive Summary

Instructions: Provide a concise synthesis of the program review findings and priorities. Draw directly from the evidence and analysis in Sections 1–6, including referenced tables and assessment results. Summarize the program's overall status, highlight key strengths and challenges, and identify the highest-priority actions for the next review cycle. This section should be brief and decision oriented.

Questions:

- Based on the evidence in Sections 1–6, what are the program's most important strengths and accomplishments during the review period (mission alignment, student outcomes, curriculum/assessment results, faculty capacity, resources, and viability/external demand)?
- What are the most significant challenges, constraints, or risks affecting program quality, sustainability, and student success? Reference the most relevant evidence and trends.
- What are the program's top 3–5 priority actions for the next cycle? For each action, include:
    - The rationale/evidence
    - The intended outcome
    - The responsible party(ies)
    - The timeline
    - How success will be measured
- What specific support, resources, or decisions are needed from the department or institution to implement the priority actions (e.g., staffing, budget, space, technology, policy changes, marketing/recruitment support)?

Sample Executive Summary (1 Page) – Example Structure

A strong executive summary typically includes:

- 2–3 sentences on overall program status and mission alignment
- 2–3 bullets on strongest evidence-based strengths
- 2–3 bullets on biggest constraints/risks (with evidence)
- A short list of 3–5 priority actions (each with owner + timeline + measure)

Part IV: Conclusion and Support Resources

The CPR process is designed not only to ensure accountability but also to strengthen programs and advance institutional goals. When faculty, department chairs, deans, and the IEP engage thoughtfully, the CPR becomes a powerful tool for continuous improvement rather than a mere compliance exercise.

Approached strategically, the CPR provides an opportunity to document achievements, plan for growth, and align programs with future needs. The benefits extend across the institution: students experience higher-quality programs, faculty engage in meaningful professional development, and leadership can make informed, data-driven decisions about resources and long-term priorities.

Applying these principles will help produce a CPR that advances both program and institutional goals.

Part V: Appendices

Appendix A: Self-Study Checklist

Use this checklist to ensure all required components are included.

PROGRAM SELF-STUDY

- ☐ Mission statement with institutional alignment
- ☐ Student development analysis with entry/exit data
- ☐ Curriculum review and learning outcomes assessment
- ☐ Faculty qualifications and productivity (aggregated)
- ☐ Program productivity analysis
- ☐ Program viability with market data
- ☐ Executive summary (1–2 pages)
- ☐ Strategic action plan with measurable goals

QUALITY CHECKS

- ☐ All data tables are clearly labeled and sourced
- ☐ Analysis is evidence-based, not merely descriptive
- ☐ Strengths and challenges are honestly addressed
- ☐ Action plans include specific, measurable goals
- ☐ Document follows page limits and formatting guidelines
- ☐ All required signatures are included
- ☐ Document has been reviewed by the dean before submission

Appendix B: Common CPR Pitfalls & How to Avoid Them

PITFALL #1: Data Dumps Without Analysis
Problem: Presenting tables without interpretation.
Solution: Follow every data table with a narrative analysis explaining what it means and what actions will be taken.

PITFALL #2: Generic Mission Statements
Problem: Statements that could apply to any program.
Solution: Include concrete examples of how the program advances institutional priorities.

PITFALL #3: Vague Assessment Reporting
Problem: Stating students met outcomes without evidence.
Solution: Include disaggregated data by outcome, benchmarks, and improvement actions.

PITFALL #4: Missing Closing the Loop
Problem: Identifying findings without explaining the changes made.
Solution: Document the complete cycle: assess, analyze, act, reassess, report results.

PITFALL #5: Defensive or Evasive Language
Problem: Minimizing challenges or blaming external factors.
Solution: Acknowledge challenges directly and focus on concrete improvement strategies.

PITFALL #6: Productivity Context Ignored
Problem: Failing to explain low enrollment numbers.
Solution: Explain why productivity is below benchmarks and provide evidence of viability.

PITFALL #7: Unsupported Viability Claims
Problem: Claiming viability without data.
Solution: Include specific data on job placement, employer demand, and salary outcomes.

PITFALL #8: Unrealistic Action Plans
Problem: Proposing goals without identifying resources.
Solution: Ensure each goal is specific, measurable, achievable, resourced, and time-bound.

PITFALL #9: Ignoring Prior Recommendations
Problem: Not addressing action items from previous reviews.
Solution: Document progress on prior recommendations and explain incomplete items.

PITFALL #10: Last-Minute Rush
Problem: Treating CPR as a compliance exercise.
Solution: Begin early, engage faculty throughout, seek feedback, and revise multiple drafts.

Appendix C: Key Definitions & Terminology

Comprehensive Program Review (CPR): A structured, evidence-based evaluation process examining program quality, productivity, and viability.
Program Quality: The effectiveness in achieving mission and learning outcomes via curriculum, faculty, assessment, and student success.
Program Productivity: The program efficiency in using resources, measured through enrollment, graduation rates, SCH production, and faculty workload.
Program Viability: The program's sustainability and strategic value via labor market demand, employment outcomes, and institutional alignment.
Student Learning Outcomes: Specific, measurable statements of what students should know, do, or value upon program completion.
Curriculum Map: Visual representation showing course-to-outcome alignment (introduced, reinforced, mastered).
Closing the Loop: Complete assessment cycle: collect data, analyze, implement improvements, reassess, measure impact.
Terminal Degree: Highest degree appropriate for a discipline (typically Ph.D., Ed.D., MFA, or equivalent).
Student Credit Hour: Unit of measurement representing one hour of classroom instruction per week for a semester.
Retention Rate: Percentage of students who continue enrollment from one year to the next.
Graduation Rate: Percentage of students completing a degree within the specified timeframe (4-year, 6-year).
Time to Degree: Average number of years or semesters students take to complete program requirements.
Disaggregated Data: Data broken down by specific categories to reveal patterns and disparities.

Comprehensive Program Review Template

2025-26

Academic Program Information

Submitter:	
Program Name:	
Department:	
School:	
Program Coordinator(s):	
Primary Contact Email:	
Review Period:	
Report Academic Year:	
Delivery Mode(s):	
Campus/Location:	

Instructions: *This comprehensive program review template is designed to support evidence-based analysis and continuous improvement.*

Throughout the template, data tables are provided to inform your responses. When a specific table is referenced, explicitly cite and interpret the relevant metrics, and connect the evidence to your conclusions. Support all claims with quantitative and/or qualitative evidence, such as assessment results, survey findings, curriculum or advising artifacts, employer/advisory feedback, or concrete examples (reference tables, appendices, or supporting documents where applicable).

Be specific about strengths, challenges, and action plans, including responsible parties, timelines, baseline measures, target outcomes, and how progress will be assessed.

If a required data element is unavailable, note the gap, explain the likely cause, and describe how and when it will be addressed.

For detailed guidance, examples, and best practices*: Consult the 2026 CPR Guide, Part III, for section-by-section instructions, model responses, effective analysis phrases, and quality checklists.*

Section 1: Program Mission and Purpose

Instructions: *Describe your program's core purpose, educational goals, and measurable objectives. Articulate how your program contributes to the institution's mission and strategic priorities.*

Questions:

- How does your program currently align with and aim to advance the College's mission, core values, and strategic direction?

- What unique features, distinctive characteristics or competitive strengths does your program offer that differentiate it from comparable programs?

- What are the program's core educational goals and measurable objectives?

Section 2: Student Development and Program Productivity

Instructions: *Analyze student attributes at program entry and exit and evaluate internal productivity metrics. Focus on what the data reveals about your program's effectiveness in developing students and maintaining sustainable enrollment patterns.*

Section 2A: Student Development Analysis

Tables 1A and 1B: Student Attributes (Entry and Exit)[1]
Five-year trend analysis of student attributes from admission to graduation, including academic performance, demographic diversity, and post-graduation outcomes.

Table 1A: Student Input

Indicators	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Average high school GPA for students entering all programs at the same degree level[2]					
Average high school GPA for students entering the program					
Average cumulative college GPA for students enrolled in all programs at the same degree level					
Average cumulative college GPA for students enrolled in the program					
Demographics					
Number and percentage of American Indian or Alaska Native (Non-Hispanic)					
Number and percentage of Asian (Non-Hispanic)					
Number and percentage of Black or African American (Non-Hispanic)					
Number and percentage of Hispanic (of any race)					
Number and percentage of Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Non-Hispanic)					
Number and percentage Two or More Races (Non-Hispanic)					
Number and percentage Unknown					

[1] *The five-year data window in seven-year program review cycles typically balances relevance, practicality, and comprehensive student outcome assessment, providing current insights while managing administrative load and capturing a baccalaureate student lifecycle.*
[2] *Bachelor's, Career Associate, or Associate*

Indicators	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Number and percentage of White (Non-Hispanic)					
Number and percentage of females					
Number and percentage of males					

Table 1B: Student Output

Indicators	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Number of Graduates from the program					
Cumulative College GPA of graduates from the program					
Graduating major GPA in Program Courses					
Employment rates within six months of graduation					
Entry rates into graduate programs					

Questions:

- Based on the data in Tables 1A and 1B (Student Attributes at Entry and Exit), what value does the program add to students' academic and career development between entry and exit? What specific changes in student attributes demonstrate program effectiveness?

- What areas show the greatest opportunity for improvement in student development outcomes?

Section 2B: Internal Productivity Analysis

Table 2: Program Productivity Indicators
Internal productivity metrics, including enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation patterns.

Indicators	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Number and percentage of majors in the program[3]					
Freshman enrollment and the percentage that number represents of total program enrollment					
Sophomore enrollment and the percentage that number represents of total program enrollment					
Junior enrollment and the percentage of that number represent the total program enrollment					
Senior enrollment and the percentage that number represents of total program enrollment					
Number and percentage of full-time students					
Number and percentage of part-time students					
Freshman retention rate (prior FY to this one, in program)					
Sophomore retention rate (prior FY to this one, in program)					
Junior retention rate (prior FY to this one, in program)					
Percentage of students persisting or graduating					
Degrees Conferred					
Average time to degree[4]					
Percentage graduating in four years or fewer					
Percentage graduating in more than four but within five years					
Percentage graduating in six years					

[3] Of the entire student body.
[4] Based on graduation year minus year of matriculation at the institution. The average can be increased by students who matriculated many years ago and lowered by those who matriculated more recently and brought transfer credits.

Questions:

- Based on Table 2 (Program Productivity Indicators), how does the program evaluate its productivity in terms of enrollment stability, retention rates, progression patterns, and graduation outcomes? What trends indicate program strengths or areas needing improvement?

- Has the University System Office flagged the program for low enrollment or low degree production? If so, what specific actions have been taken in response, and what have been the results?

- How does your program compare to institutional benchmarks, peer programs, or national averages for retention and graduation rates?

Section 3: Curriculum, Learning Outcomes, and Assessment

Instructions: *Describe the structure and coherence of the curriculum and how it supports student achievement of program learning outcomes. Summarize key assessment findings from the review period and explain how evidence has been used to improve curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning ("closing the loop"). Reference relevant data tables and assessment artifacts where applicable.*

Questions:

Curriculum structure and sequencing

- How is the curriculum structured and sequenced to support progression toward program learning outcomes?

  In your response, describe:

  - The overall curriculum map (e.g., which courses are introductory, developing, or advanced for each program learning outcome).
  - How do required and elective courses build toward the capstone or other culminating experiences?
  - Any identified bottlenecks, redundancies, or misalignments in course sequencing and how they affect student progression.

Evidence-driven programmatic and curricular changes

- What programmatic or curricular changes have been implemented (or are planned) in response to assessment and other evidence (e.g., student performance, survey data, advisory board feedback)?

  In your response, describe:

  - The specific evidence that prompted each change.
  - The nature of the change (e.g., new course, revised prerequisite, redesigned assignment, change in modality or sequencing).
  - How will you determine whether each change improves student learning outcomes, including the measures and success criteria you will use?

Section 4: Faculty Capacity and Professional Development

Instructions: *Evaluate whether faculty capacity, qualifications, and professional development are sufficient to deliver the curriculum and support the program's priorities. Focus on staffing adequacy, faculty expertise, stability, and development needs that directly affect instruction, advising, student mentoring, and implementation of improvements identified in Section 3.*

Questions:

- Based on Table 3 (Faculty Qualifications and Productivity), assess whether the program has adequate faculty capacity and appropriate expertise to deliver the curriculum and meet student needs. What strengths and gaps does the data reveal (e.g., rank mix, tenure/NTT balance, terminal degree levels, use of part-time faculty)?

- What professional development opportunities, mentoring initiatives, and support structures are in place for faculty across all ranks/tracks? How do these supports strengthen teaching effectiveness, student support, and implementation of program improvements?

- What faculty-related priorities will you pursue in the next review cycle (e.g., hiring strategy, workload adjustments, mentoring, training, succession planning)? Include timelines, responsible parties, and how you will assess progress.

Table 3: Indicators of Faculty Qualifications and Productivity
Key indicators include the percentage of terminally degreed faculty, tenure ratios, diversity representation, and distribution across academic ranks.

Indicators	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Full-Time					
Total Number					
Terminally degreed (and %)					
Tenured (and %)					
Tenure Track (and %)					
Non-Tenure Track (and %)					
Professor (and %)					
Associate Professor (and %)					
Assistant Professor (and %)					
Instructor (and %)					
Other (e.g., Lecturer) (and %)					
Part-Time					
Total Number					
Terminally degreed (and %)					

Section 5: Resource Adequacy and Support

Instructions: *Evaluate the adequacy of resources and support structures that enable your program to achieve its mission and objectives. Address both current resource levels and anticipated needs.*

Questions:

- Assess the adequacy of the program's budget and funding. What trends have you observed over the past five years, and how have budget changes affected program quality and capacity?

- Evaluate the adequacy of facilities, laboratories, specialized equipment, and learning spaces for your program. What facility improvements or additions would enhance student learning and program effectiveness?

- Assess the adequacy of technology infrastructure, software, instructional resources, and library collections. How well do current technology resources support teaching, learning, and research/creative activities?

- Evaluate administrative and staff support for the program, including advising, administrative assistance, and technical support. Are current support levels adequate for programming needs?

- What are your highest-priority resource needs for the next review cycle? How would addressing these needs improve program quality and student outcomes?

Section 6: Program Viability and Strategic Positioning

Instructions: *Evaluate the program's viability by analyzing (1) student demand for the program and (2) external demand for the program's graduates. Use Table 4 to interpret student demand trends. In addition to the internal outcome indicators in Table 1B, incorporate at least two external sources of demand evidence (e.g., employer/advisory board input, internship/placement partner feedback, licensure/credentialing bodies, labor market data, transfer pathway data, competitor/program scans, regional workforce reports). Use this evidence to identify strengths, risks, and strategies to sustain or grow the program.*

Questions:

- Based on Table 4 (Program Viability Indicators), what do the trends suggest about student demand (e.g., applications, admits, yield, and declaration patterns)? Identify strengths, risks, and any notable shifts over the review period.

- Beyond the internal outcomes reported in Table 1B, what evidence indicates external demand for graduates (e.g., employer/advisory input, internship/placement partner feedback, licensure/credentialing outcomes where applicable, labor market data, alumni outcomes)? What are the implications for program positioning, partnerships, recruitment, or curriculum emphasis (without repeating Section 3's assessment narrative)?

- What specific strategies will the program implement to strengthen viability (e.g., recruitment pathways, partnerships, marketing/communications, advising improvements, internship pipelines, modality changes)? Include responsible parties, timelines, and how success will be measured.

Table 4: Program Viability Indicators
These indicators summarize student demand and program sustainability across the review period, including recruitment and entry points (applications through enrollment), declaration timing, and reliance on cross-department instructional support.

Indicators	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
Number of students who applied to the program					
Number of students who were admitted to the program					
Number of students who enrolled in the program					
Acceptance rate of the program					
Yield rate (admit-to-enroll) of the program					
Number of students who declared the program at >=30 but <60 cumulative credit hours					
Number of students who declared the program at >=60 but <90 cumulative credit hours					
Number of students who declared the program at >=90 cumulative credit hours					
Cross-department instructional support (number of contributing faculty and % of instructional coverage)					

Section 7: Executive Summary

Instructions: *Provide a concise synthesis of the program review findings and priorities. Draw directly from the evidence and analysis in Sections 1–6, including referenced tables and assessment results. Summarize the program's overall status, highlight key strengths and challenges, and identify the highest-priority actions for the next review cycle. This section should be brief and decision-oriented.*

Questions:

- Based on the evidence in Sections 1–6, what are the program's most important strengths and accomplishments during the review period (mission alignment, student outcomes, curriculum/assessment results, faculty capacity, resources, and viability/external demand)?

- What are the most significant challenges, constraints, or risks affecting program quality, sustainability, and student success? Reference the most relevant evidence and trends.

- What are the program's top 3–5 priority actions for the next cycle? For each action, include: (a) the rationale/evidence, (b) the intended outcome, (c) the responsible party(ies), (d) the timeline, and (e) how success will be measured.

- What specific support, resources, or decisions are needed from the department, College, or institution to implement the priority actions (e.g., staffing, budget, space, technology, policy changes, marketing/recruitment support)?

Comprehensive Program Review

Assessment Rubric

[Program Name & Degree Level]
Review Period: [Years] | Reviewer: [Name] | Date: [Date]

Purpose

This rubric provides a consistent, evidence-based framework for evaluating Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs). It supports objective scoring across programs and reviewers, and it helps identify strengths, gaps, and improvement actions that strengthen program quality and strategic planning.

How to Use This Rubric

- Read the full CPR before scoring any section.
- Score each section using the checklist criteria. Only check a criterion if it is clearly supported by specific, easy-to-find evidence (e.g., named metrics, referenced tables, analysis, targets, timelines, owners, or next steps).
- Assign a section rating based on criteria met:
    - All criteria = 4 (Exemplary)
    - 75%+ = 3 (Proficient)
    - 50–74% = 2 (Developing)
    - <50% = 1 (Needs Revision)
- Use Reviewer Notes to justify the rating. Include page/table references or brief quotes when possible.
- Provide actionable feedback. When a criterion is not met, state exactly what should be added or revised.
- Calculate the overall score by averaging the seven section ratings and record the score distribution (4s, 3s, 2s, 1s).
- Write summary feedback for leadership review, including 2–3 strengths, 2–3 improvement areas, and recommended next steps.

Rating Scale

Score	Criteria
4	**Exemplary:** All required criteria met. Evidence-based, analytical, actionable.
3	**Proficient:** Most criteria met (75%+). Minor gaps in depth or specificity.
2	**Developing:** Some criteria met (50-74%). Significant gaps in evidence/action plans.
1	**Needs Revision:** Few criteria met (<50%). Requires substantial revision.

Section Evaluation Criteria Section

1: Mission & Purpose

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Names 2+ institutional priorities and explains program support ☐ Identifies 2+ unique features with concrete examples ☐ States 2-4 measurable objectives (quantifiable indicators of success)	

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Articulates how the program aligns with and advances the College's mission, core values, and strategic direction, with specific examples or evidence ☐ Identifies 2+ distinctive features or competitive strengths that differentiate the program from comparable programs ☐ States 3+ specific, measurable educational goals or objectives for the program ☐ Connects program purpose explicitly to institutional strategic priorities (not just general mission language)	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 2A: Student Development (Tables 1A & 1B)

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Cites 3+ specific metrics from Tables 1A/1B by name ☐ Explains causes of 2+ observed trends (not just describes them) ☐ Identifies 1+ equity gap or disparity with action response ☐ States how success will be measured for improvements	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 2B: Internal Productivity (Table 2)

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Identifies multi-year trends (not just year-to-year changes) ☐ Compares to institutional averages or states if unavailable ☐ Provides context (e.g., curriculum changes, pandemic impact) ☐ Sets 1+ measurable targets with owner and timeline	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 3: Curriculum & Assessment

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Explains curriculum structure/sequencing with specific course examples ☐ Cites 2+ assessment results (methods, findings, % proficient) ☐ Names 1+ curriculum/teaching change made based on assessment ☐ States when/how the impact will be re-assessed	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 4: Faculty Capacity (Table 3)

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Reports faculty composition (FT vs PT) and identifies gaps ☐ Links faculty expertise/development to student outcomes ☐ Proposes hiring or development plan with timeline ☐ Defines success metrics for the plan	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 5: Resources & Support

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Addresses all 4 domains: budget, facilities, technology, and staff support ☐ Provides specific evidence (e.g., dollar amounts, square footage, FTE) ☐ Ranks top 3 priorities with impact statements (what's at risk) ☐ Defines success metrics for each priority	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 6: Viability & Demand (Table 4 + external)

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Interprets Table 4 trends (apps, yield, declaration timing) ☐ Includes 2+ external sources (employer feedback, labor data, etc.) ☐ Name 2+ viability strategies with evidence-based rationale ☐ Sets measurable targets for each strategy	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Section 7: Executive Summary

Key Criteria (Must Include)	Rating (1-4)
☐ Synthesizes key findings from Sections 1-6 (1-2 pages max) ☐ Lists 3-5 priorities, each with: rationale, outcome, timeline, metrics ☐ States specific support needed from College ☐ Decision-ready format (could stand alone as brief)	_____

Reviewer Notes:

[Note specific strengths and improvement areas with evidence]

Overall Assessment Summary

Metric	Score	Notes
Overall Section Score	_____ /4.0	*[Average of 7 section scores]*
Score Distribution	—	*4: ____ | 3: ____ | 2: ____ | 1: ____*
Overall Recommendation	—	*[Approve / Revise & Resubmit / Other]*

Summary Feedback

Major Strengths (2-3 key accomplishments):

Priority Improvement Areas (2-3 critical needs):

Recommendations for Next Steps:

Comprehensive Program Review – Dean's Memorandum

Dean:
Program Name:
Department:
School:
Review Period:

> **Instructions**
> *Please respond to the following questions based on your independent assessment of the program. Your feedback is crucial for the comprehensive review process and will contribute to the continuous improvement of the program.*

Program Quality and Curriculum
How would you rate the overall quality of the program, considering curriculum relevance, faculty qualifications, teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes?

Program Viability and Market Demand
To what extent does the program align with the institution's mission, demonstrate market demand, and show potential for growth or innovation?

Program Productivity and Efficiency
How would you evaluate the program's productivity in terms of enrollment trends, graduation rates, faculty workload, scholarship output, and resource utilization?

Recommendations
Based on your assessment, what are the top 2-3 strategic recommendations for the program?

Overall Assessment
What is your overall evaluation of the program?

Comprehensive Program Review – VPAA's Memorandum

Program Name:
Department:
School:
Date of Review Completion:

Summary Determination

Based on evidence and findings from the Comprehensive Program Review, the following institutional action is recommended. *(Check all that apply and provide justification where required.)*

☑ Program MEETS Institutional Criteria

☐ **Aligned with Institutional Mission:**
The program aligns with the college's strategic priorities and core values and contributes meaningfully to student learning and community impact.

☐ **High Demand/Strategic Growth:**
The program demonstrates strong enrollment, market demand, or workforce alignment and will be prioritized for investment or expansion.

⚠ Program DOES NOT MEET Criteria

☐ Program continues to meet minimal criteria but shows trends (e.g., low enrollment or graduation rates) that warrant periodic review.

☐ CPR identified gaps in learning outcomes, disciplinary relevance, or stakeholder alignment. A full curriculum review and update are required.

☐ Program may require adjustments in faculty load, space, or administrative support to remain sustainable.

☐ Other (identify/add text)

Recommendation Summary

Provide a brief synthesis (3–5 sentences) of findings from the CPR that informed this recommendation:

Authorization

VPAA Name (Printed): _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

OR

Designee Name (Printed): _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____