

Report Template

Criterion 1: History, Development, and Expectations of the Program

Describe how the program has evolved over the years and how it has responded to changing environments and the expectations of the students and the discipline. (300 words)

Criterion 2: External Demand for the Program

Data will be provided by the administration:

	2016 Fall	2017 Fall	2018 Fall	2019 Fall	2020 Oct Census
Application numbers for the program					
Number of students admitted to the program					
Number of new students enrolled in the program					
Yield (percentage of admitted students that enrolled)					
Number of new transfer students (to Rider and program)					

(Table: External Demand; Table Code: ExDemand_C2)

2.1 The following colleges and universities are our direct competitors and most likely your program’s competitors: (List to be provided by the administration per college.)

A. Are there other schools not named whose program is a direct competitor of yours? If so, please list them.

B. Please discuss your distinct programmatic differences from the programs identified above. (200 words)

2.2 Please provide a list of up to five typical associated career paths of the program’s graduates and their respective labor market projections using the format below:

Job title	Employment (2020)	Projected Growth (2020-2030) %
Dental laboratory technician (example)		

(Table: Labor Market Projections; Table Code: LaborMkt_C2Q2)

Data can be found at O-Net (Information will be provided by administration). If the program has other data sources that supplements O-Net, please identify: (200 words)

Criterion 3: Internal Demand for the Program

Data will be provided by the administration

	2018 Fall census	2019 Fall census	2020 Fall census
Number of students enrolled			
Number of student credit hours generated by students in the program			
Number of student credit hours generated by students in the program in courses offered by the department in which the program resides			
Number of student credit hours taught by the department			

(Table: Internal Demand; Table code: IntDemand_C3)

Criterion 4: Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

Data will be provided by the administration

	2018 Fall census	2019 Fall census	2020 Fall census
Student Retention in the program			

(Table: Retention; Table Code: Retention_C4)

	2018 Fall census	2019 Fall census	2020 Fall census
--	------------------	------------------	------------------

Incoming freshman high school GPA (mean)			
High School Quality Score			
Incoming transfer student GPA (mean)			
Incoming Graduate Student GPA (mean)			

(Table: *Quality Indicators*; Table Code: *QI_C4*)

Data will be provided by administration

FT tenured, tenure-track, lecturer	
Over the last three years, % of courses taught by FT faculty (in load and overload)	

(Table: *Faculty Information*; Table Code: *FacInfo_C4*)

- 4.1 Please list faculty members' activity on regional, national and international boards, journal editors, etc. during the last five years. (200 words)
- 4.2 Describe faculty scholarly productivity (international, national, regional) over the last five years. (200 words)
- 4.3 When was the last time the program was evaluated internally?
- 4.4 When was the last time the program was evaluated externally?
- 4.5 What were the recommendations from the most recent internal and/or external reviews and how have those recommendations been addressed? (200 words)
- 4.6 Does your department have a process for student learning outcomes assessment for the program, and if so, please describe that process. (200 words)
- 4.7 Please comment on the trends of student participation in the list of activities below. Discuss other high impact activities students in the program participate in. (200 words)

Data will be provided by administration where available

	2018	2019	2020
% of students who participated in international experiences			
% of students who complete internships/co-ops			

% of students who conduct collaborative work with faculty (e.g. research, performances)			
---	--	--	--

(Table: High Impact Experiences; Table Code: HIE_C4)

4.8 Does the program curriculum have an integrative or capstone experience? If so, describe the experience? (200 words)

4.9 Describe how teaching quality is evaluated in your program and describe how the program strives to achieve and maintain teaching excellence. (200 words)

Criterion 5: Quality of Program Outcomes

Data will be provided by the administration.

The following information describes the program's graduation rates, job and graduate placement rates, and alumni engagement:

	2013	2014	2015
4 year graduation rate			
6 year graduation rate			

(Table: Graduation Rate Data; Table Code: GradRate_Q5)

AY 2019-2020	Response Rate	% of Program Graduates
Job placement rate 6 months after graduation		
% of program graduates who enter graduate programs		

(Table: Alumni; Table Code: Alumni_Q5)

5.1 Discuss the data presented in the table listed above. Are there any other outcomes data (e.g. from students, alumni, employers)? If so, please provide and comment on it. (200 words)

5.2 How are your alumni engaged in your program?

Criterion 6: Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program

6.1 Identify any services provided by this program to the external community and describe them, their scope, and importance. (200 words)

6.2 What external affiliations and/or collaborations does your program have? Describe their scope and importance. (200 words)

- 6.3 Describe how your department has worked to keep your program current? (200 words)
- 6.4 Identify any ways in which departmental efficiency has been maximized (e.g., sharing faculty and or courses with other programs, considering interdisciplinary programming and or research, changing course rotations, etc.) Looking ahead, how might your department maximize departmental efficiencies? (200 words)

Criterion 7: Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

Data will be provided by the administration.

The following table shows revenue for the program (i.e. tuition, fees, room, and net board generated by the students enrolled in the program)

5 years	2018	2019	2020
Program Net Tuition & Fee Revenue (1 st Majors)			

(Table: Program Revenue; Table Code: PrgRevenue_C7)

5 years	2018	2019	2020
Program Net Tuition & Fee Revenue (2 nd – 4 th Majors)			

(Table: Major 2nd - 4th Revenue; Table Code:Major2-4Revenue_C7)

The following table shows revenue for the department's course offerings (regardless of the students' programs of study)

5 years	2018	2019	2020
Department's Course Offerings' Tuition and Fee Revenue			

(Table: Department Course Revenue; Table Code:DeptRevenue_C7)

The following table shows department's grant revenue:

5 years	2018	2019	2020
Department's Grant Revenue			

(Table: Department Grant Revenue; Table Code: GrantRevenue_C7)

- 7.1 Please feel free to comment on the above data. For example, if there are other sources of revenue that are not accounted for in the data provided or whether the institution is a recipient of development or advancement dollars for endowed scholarships or other gifts

because of the program and describe their significance.

Criterion 8: Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program

Data will be provided by the administration.

The following data shows expenses associated with offering the program:

5 years	FY 2018 (i.e., July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018)	FY 2019	FY 2020
Expenses associated with offering the program			

(Table: Program Expenses; Table Code: ProgExp_Q8)

The following data shows expenses associated with the department's course offerings:

5 years	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Department's Instructional Expenses (Inload, AOL, Cnt9)			
Department's Operating Expenses			
College expenses attributable to department			
Divisional expenses attributable to department			
TOTAL EXPENSES			

(Table: Department Expenses; Table Code: DeptExp_C8)

University expenses (such as central administration, athletics, facilities, auxiliary services, etc.) are not included above. Departments should estimate that \$____ can be allocated to each student in such costs.

5 years	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Ratio (%) of Operational and Instructional Costs to Total Revenue.			
Ratio (%) of Program Expenses to Program Revenue			
Program's Profit/Loss			

(Table: Ratio and Profit/Loss; Table: RPL_C8)

- 8.1 Please comment on the above data. Examples include the demonstrable cost efficiencies in the way the program is operated (or which could be initiated) that are (or might be) beneficial to the institution, or unusual costs that are unique to this program.

Criterion 9: Impact and Mission Centrality

This criterion addresses the overall impact and need of the program in terms of its visibility, uniqueness and its relationships to other academic programs and institutional mission of the university.

- 9.1 Explain the relationship of this program to the success of other programs. (200 words)
- 9.2 Identify how the program contributes to the [mission of the University](#). (200 words)
- 9.3 Describe the extent to which this program helps the University differentiate itself from other colleges and universities; rankings; program level accreditation, curriculum, unique features, etc. (200 words)

Criterion 10: Opportunity Analysis of the Program

This criterion looks to the future of the program, and invites projections related to new delivery methods, formats, audiences, and other opportunities.

- 10.1 What opportunities exist that can grow enrollments, improve retention, and result in other meaningful outcomes in your program in the next three years? (200 words)

Rubric

		Exemplary	Accomplished	Satisfactory	Needs Impro	Unsatisfactory
	Criterion Weight (% of Overall Weight)	5	4	3	2	1
Criterion 1 History, Development, and Expectations of the Program						3%
Q1	100% (3%)	The program provides compelling evidence that it is responding to the changing needs of students, environments, and expectations		The program provides evidence that it is responding to the changing needs of students, environments, and expectations, but it is not compelling.		The program provides limited evidence that it is responding to the changing needs of student, environments, and expectations
Criterion 2 External Demand for the Program						13.2%
Table data/applicant data	46% (6.0%)	The data provided show that there is a growing, sustainable student demand		The data provided show that there is a sustainable student demand		The data provided show that there is limited student demand
Q 2.1	36% (4.8%)	The program provides unique programmatic opportunities not found in competitive schools		The program provides equivalent programmatic opportunities found in competitive schools		The program lacks programmatic opportunities found in competitive schools
Q 2.2	18% (2.4%)	The program provides students with access to		The program provides students with access to		The program provides students with access to

		growing career paths		stable career paths		declining career paths
Criterion 3 Internal Demand for the Program						12%
Data Table	100% (12%)	Evidence shows strong internal demand and or exceptional service to other university programs (graduate or undergraduate)		Evidence shows moderate internal demand and or moderate service to other university programs (graduate or undergraduate)		Evidence shows moderate internal demand or service to other university programs (graduate or undergraduate)
Criterion 4 Quality of Program Inputs and Processes						20%
Table <i>Retention</i>	29 (5.8%)	Student retention is above the average for the University		Student retention is average for the University		Student retention is below the average for the University
Table <i>Quality Indicators</i>	7 (1.4%)	Student test scores are above the average for the University		Student test scores are average for the University		Student test scores are below the average for the University
Table <i>Faculty Information</i>	The data in the faculty table will not be scored but will rather be used to provide context and to inform the taskforce and its report back to the program.					
4.1 and 4.2	12 (2.4%)	The faculty makes significant contributions to the discipline		The faculty makes adequate contributions to the discipline		The faculty makes limited contributions to the discipline
4.3, 4.4, 4.5	13 (2.6%)	Program is regularly evaluated and there is evidence of using assessment data for program improvement		Program is occasionally evaluated and there is some evidence of using assessment data for program improvement		Program is not evaluated.

4.6	13 (2.6%)	Student learning outcomes are regularly evaluated and there is strong evidence of using assessment data for program improvement		Student learning outcomes are occasionally evaluated and there is limited evidence of using assessment data for program improvement		Student learning outcomes are not adequately evaluated.
4.7, 4.8	8 (1.6%)	All students participate in high impact activities		Most students participate in high impact activities		Few students participate in high impact activities
4.9	12 (2.4%)	The program shows exemplary evidence of appropriate course delivery methods		The program shows adequate evidence of appropriate course delivery methods		The program shows limited evidence of appropriate course delivery methods
4.10	6 (1.2%)	Program provides evidence of ongoing and effective efforts to assess and improve teaching quality		Program provides some evidence of ongoing and effective efforts to assess and improve teaching quality		Program provides limited evidence of ongoing and effective efforts to assess and improve teaching quality
4.11, 4.12	Responses to these questions will not be scored but will rather be used to provide context and to inform the taskforce and its report back to the program.					
Criterion 5 Quality of Program Outcomes						11.2%
Table <i>Graduation Rate Data</i>	60% (7.2%)	Graduation rates are above Rider average		Graduation rates are at Rider average		Graduation rates are below Rider average
Table <i>Alumni</i>	20% (2%)	Student placement data is above national average		Student placement data is consistent with national average		Student placement data is below national average

Table <i>Alumni</i>	20% (2%)	Program and data provide evidence of extensive alumni engagement		Program and data provide evidence of alumni engagement		Program and data provide little or no evidence of alumni engagement
Criterion 6 Size, Scope and Productivity of the Program						5%
6.1-6.2	40% (2%)	Program provides strong evidence of significant community engagement		Program provides evidence of community engagement		Program provides little or no evidence of community engagement
6.3	60% (3%)	Given the resources, the program provides exceptional depth and or breadth of the discipline		Given the resources, the program provides satisfactory depth and or breadth of the discipline		Given the resources, the program does not provide appropriate depth or breadth of the discipline
6.4	Responses to these questions will not be scored but will rather be used to provide context and to inform the taskforce and its report back to the program.					
Criterion 7&8 Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program and Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program						20%
Program Profit or Loss	50 (10%)	The program generates exceptional net income		The program generates satisfactory net revenue		The program generates less than satisfactory net revenue
	50 (10%)	The program's ratio of instructional expenses to revenue is below Rider average		The program's ratio of instructional expenses to revenue is at Rider average		The program's ratio of instructional expenses to revenue is above Rider average
7.1, 8.1	Responses to these questions will not be scored but will rather be used to provide context and to inform the taskforce and its report back to the program (unless they substantively change either the net income or the ratio of instructional expenses to revenue).					
Criterion 9 Impact and Mission Centrality						9.6%
9.1	25 (2.4%)	The program is vital to success of other programs		The program has moderate impact on success of other programs		The program does not impact success of other programs

9.2	37.5 (3.6%)	The program contributes significantly to the University mission		The program contributes moderately to the University mission		The program contributes minimally to the University mission
9.3	37.5 (3.6%)	The program provides strong evidence of distinctive strengths not found among our peer institutions (curricular and or co-curricular)		The program provides moderate evidence of distinctive strengths not found among our peer institutions (curricular and or co-curricular)		The program provides little or no evidence of distinctive strengths as compared to our peer institutions (curricular and or co-curricular)
Criterion 10 Opportunity Analysis of the Program						6%
10.1	100% (6%)	The program demonstrates strong potential for growth		The program demonstrates moderate potential for growth		The program demonstrates no potential for growth

Rubric Summary

Criterion 1	3
History and Expectations of the Program	3%
Criterion 2	13.2
Applications/New Students/Transfers	6%
Program distinctiveness	4.8%
Job Outlook for Graduates	2.4%
Criterion 3	12
Program and course enrollments	12%
Criterion 4	20
Retention	5.8%
Incoming Student Quality Indicators	1.4%
Faculty Productivity	2.4%
Program Evaluation	2.6%
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment	2.6%
Faculty/Student Scholarships	1.6%
High Impact Activity Participation	2.4%
Service Component of the Program/Integration with others	1.2%
Criterion 5	11.2
Graduation Rates	7.2%
Job Placement/Grad School Attendance	2%
Alumni Engagement	2%
Criterion 6	5
Community Engagement	2%
Breadth and Depth of Program	3%
Criteria 7&8	20
Program (e.g. BSBA Accounting) net income	10%
Departments net income (e.g. ACC courses)	10%
Criterion 9	9.6
Vital to other programs	2.4%
Mission centrality	3.6%
Distinctive strength	3.6%
Criterion 10	6
Growth potential	6%