INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for agreeing to be an external reviewer for the PLNU Program Review process. We are grateful for your engagement with us and look forward to your feedback and insights. We are including the co-curricular unit’s entire self-study document in order to give you context. While we appreciate your feedback on the entire self-study, we especially look forward to your feedback on the specific program that you have agreed to review. The Vice President, Associate Vice President, or Director of the co-curricular unit will be your main points of contact and will arrange opportunity for you to interact with them and/or other departmental personnel as appropriate. This will allow you a chance to ask questions or seek clarification prior to the completion of your report.

We have created the following external reviewer template for your report in an attempt to give you some guidance in terms of what type of feedback we are hoping to get. The text boxes are there for your convenience, but if they get in the way or create formatting issues, feel free to delete them and put your text in their place. This is a new process for us so we have created a space at the end to provide any feedback on the process that can help us create a better instrument in the future.

With gratitude for your service,

[Type Name of Co-Curricular Vice President]

Point Loma Nazarene University
3900 Lomaland Drive
San Diego, CA 92106-2810
CO-CURRICULAR DEPARTMENT-LEVEL ANALYSIS

A) Introduction

B) Alignment with Mission

Please review and evaluate the co-curricular unit’s response to the questions regarding mission alignment of their unit with the university mission, vision, and strategic goals from a Christian faith perspective. Are there any suggestions for how the unit might better articulate and demonstrate their purpose and alignment?

C) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Please review the narrative supplied for this section. Wherever appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

D2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the co-curricular program’s responses to their assessment findings? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan, program offerings, or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis?

D3. Comparator Analysis and Potential Impact of National Trends

After reviewing the program’s discussion of comparator and aspirational institutions, as well as possible impacts from trends, discuss the areas of strength or need for improvement not adequately addressed by the self-study.

D4. Unit Focus

After reviewing the program’s discussion of unit focus regarding an area of development, please and identify any particular strengths and/or weaknesses that you might see. Please offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the co-curricular program to consider.
D5. Infrastructure and Staffing

After reviewing the co-curricular program’s discussion of its infrastructure and staffing, please discuss the quality of their analysis and reflection in this important area and offer any suggestions or insights that you might suggest they consider.

D7. Financial Analysis

Based on the data and responses provided by the program, please evaluate the effectiveness of the co-curricular program’s cost efficiencies and revenue streams (if any). Are there any strategies or practices that may increase the demand for the program and/or improve its overall cost efficiency without negatively impacting quality?

Note: Section of the self-study withheld due to sensitive data.

D8. Challenges and Opportunities and Recommendations

Do you feel the report adequately identifies challenges and opportunities based on your understanding of the co-curricular program? Why or why not? Are there other challenges or opportunities that you would like to identify?

EXTERNAL REVIEWER’S COMMENTS ON PROCESS

External Reviewer Feedback on PLNU Program Review Process

We recognize that there are multiple ways to approach a program review. We would value your feedback on our process so that that we can continue to make it better and more helpful to the programs undergoing review. Are there areas that were confusing or sections that you felt were unhelpful? Are there areas that you were not asked about where you believe you could have provided useful information? Is there anything about the process that you would recommend changing to improve its effectiveness?