**Internal Review Report Guidelines/Template**

**Undergraduate**

The evaluation and subsequent recommendations of ongoing program review are critically important to the University. They shape the direction of the program for the next eight years. The recommendations, therefore, need to be focused on specific areas of improvement. Each recommendation must be supported by a brief rationale.

The Self-Study provides the data the committee will need to answer these questions, but additional information should be gathered by interviewing faculty, students, and administrators.

Listed under each question are different aspects of the issue that need to be addressed. Please use the information included in the Self-Study, the Status Report, and the team’s data collection to create the Internal Review Report.

1. Review Information
   1. Program Name:
   2. Review Date:
   3. Internal Review Team Members and Chair:
   4. Describe how the review was conducted
2. Previous Review
   1. To what extent has the program adequately addressed the recommendations set forth by the previous program review. What patterns are notable? (Please consider the response in the self-study, all interview data, and the previous interim review.)
3. Student Learning Benchmarks or Outcomes
   1. Are the students meeting the program’s student learning benchmarks or outcomes?
      1. Does the program assess student learning adequately?
      2. What changes have been made in the program as a result of assessment?
      3. Are the changes appropriate to reflect continuous improvement?
   2. Do the curriculum and the courses support the student learning benchmarks or outcomes?
      1. Is the curriculum based upon a solid core of knowledge that supports the entire learning experience for students?
      2. Are the course content and the program of study of sufficient intellectual rigor? Does the program immerse students in the discipline?
      3. Does the program provide the students with appropriate opportunity to apply their knowledge and skills (internships, practica, fieldwork, laboratories, assistantships, research, papers, theses)?
   3. Does the environment support student learning benchmarks or outcomes?
      1. Is there sufficient institutional support for the learning environment (library collection, equipment, computing, laboratories/studios, resources, etc?)
      2. Does the program provide adequate mentoring/advising for students?
      3. Does the program set a standard of excellence?
      4. Has the program implemented changes related to diversity, equity, and inclusion? If not, are such plans under consideration?
4. Enrollment and Retention
   1. Is the program serving an adequate number of students to ensure its sustainability? (This response should consider the program’s past and current enrollment, optimal enrollment goals, and estimates for maximum enrollment and enrollment based on race/ethnic, non-resident alien (international), male/female, and ability status. Additionally, the response must take into account service responsibilities for general education, courses for other majors, etc.) What institutional support does the program need to address over-enrollment or under-enrollment or disparities in race/ethnic, non-resident alien (international), male/female, and ability status?
   2. Does the program support student retention and completion of the degree? What data support this finding and what actions has the program undertaken to achieve these goals? Are differences in retention and/or degree completion based on race/ethnic, non-resident alien (international), male/female, and ability status apparent?
   3. Does the program provide an inclusive climate that supports underrepresented students?
   4. Do students have adequate opportunities for advising, mentoring, and collaboration?
   5. Does the faculty have adequate support and resources to be successful in their teaching, research and service activities?
5. Overall Strengths (1 paragraph)
6. Overall Opportunities for Improvement (1 paragraph)
7. **Major findings and specific recommendations with rationales.**
8. Rating with Rationale
   1. **Exemplary**: Significant developed outcomes and strengths across all or most elements, no weaknesses that are correctable
   2. **Notable Merit:** Well developed with positive outcomes or traits in many areas, but with some opportunities for improvement
   3. **Satisfactory:** Functional with potential for developing greater strengths, but with some areas needing greater attention, time, resources, etc.
   4. **Immediate Attention Needed:** Developing functionality on multiple fronts but demonstrates insufficient knowledge of potential outcomes and plans
   5. **Remediation Required:** Minimal or no progress in key areas with little evidence of outcomes or inadequate attention to improvement efforts
9. Are there any external/environmental issues that may warrant on-going monitoring of the program's resources, plans, and changes? (Yes/No with explanation)