



CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAM REVIEW
External Reviewer Report Template

Version 12-20-16

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?

Click here to enter text.

C) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Please review the narrative supplied for this section. Discuss whether it provided a good accounting and rationale for what changes have or have not been made based on the previous program review and/or any circumstances that have arisen since. Wherever appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

Click here to enter text.

CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL ANALYSIS

D1. Program-Level Alignment with Mission and University Strategic Goals

Please evaluate the program's alignment and contribution to the university's mission and strategic goals as described in the review. Is the alignment clearly articulated? Are the missional contributions evident? Are there any discontinuities?

Click here to enter text.

D2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the co-curricular program's responses to their assessment findings, do you think the program is effectively using their assessment activities and data? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis? Discuss the quality of their analysis and identify elements of their analysis that you think could be strengthened.

Click here to enter text.

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 national trends, discuss the quality of their responses and areas of strength or need for improvement not adequately addressed by the self-study.

Click here to enter text.

D4. Quality Markers

After reviewing the program's discussion of its quality markers and the questions posed in this section of the self-study, please discuss the quality of their response to these questions 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 with regard to their quality markers.

Click here to enter text.

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.

Click here to enter text.

D6. Internal and External Demand for the Program/Service

Based on the data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the internal and external demand in terms of appeal of the co-curricular program's services as well as demonstrated need.

Click here to enter text.

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

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, according to your review of the self-study and your understanding of the program in today's higher education context?

Click here to enter text.

D9. Recommendations for Program Improvement

Do you feel the recommendations made for this co-curricular program are supported by the analysis and evidence provided in the self-study document? Why or why not? Are there other recommendations or suggestions that you would make that the academic unit should consider? If so, please give a brief rationale.

Click here to enter text.

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?

Click here to enter text.