

<p align="center">Criterion 1 History, Development, and Expectations of the Program: This criterion focuses on providing a brief overview that includes historical background/factors.</p>				
	3	2	1	0
1) Describe how the program was developed (e.g. consultation from community elders, program developers, staff and students, or culture committee)	Strong evidence indicates program was developed in consultation with various sources	Moderate evidence indicates program was developed in consultation with various sources	Minimal evidence indicates program was developed in consultation with various sources	Insufficient evidence indicates program was developed in consultation with various sources
2) Changes in scope of services	Strong evidence that the program evolution has been in response to the community need	Moderate evidence that the program evolution has been in response to the community need	Provides little evidence that the program evolution has been in response to community need	Insufficient details of program evolution has been in response to community need

<p align="center">Criterion 2 Community Demand for the program: This criterion is intended to assess demand for the program from stakeholders and entities. This includes prospective students, employers, and tribal communities at large. This criterion also gives programs the opportunity to identify their local, state and federal external stakeholders.</p>				
	3	2	1	0
1) Program interest data	Strong evidence of program interest (4 or more specific examples/data sources)	Moderate evidence of program interest (2-3 specific examples/data sources)	Minimal evidence of program interest (1 specific example/data source)	Insufficient evidence of program interest
2) Number/list of communities served and collaborations	Evidence of serving and collaborating with Lummi and all 6 extended campus sites and other external collaborations	Evidence of serving and collaborating Lummi and 4 extended campus sites and other external collaborations	Evidence of serving and collaborating less than Lummi and 2 extended campus sites and other external collaborations	Insufficient evidence of serving and collaborating with Lummi and extended campus sites and other external collaborations

Criterion 3				
Internal demand/integration of the program:				
	3	2	1	0
1) Identify program collaboration or services provided to other departments or programs	Strong evidence that the activities, collaborations, or services provided contribute to the success of other programs (4 or more specific examples or data sources)	Moderate evidence that the activities, collaborations, or services provided contribute to the success of other programs (2-3 specific examples or data sources)	Minimal evidence that the activities, collaborations, or services provided contribute to the success of other programs (1 specific example or data source)	Insufficient evidence of program collaborations or services
Academic ONLY: 1) Program core courses/credit hours offered by program that are required in other programs	Strong evidence that the program core courses are required by other programs (50% or more program core courses are required by other programs)	Moderate Strong evidence that the program core courses are required by other programs (25-49% or more program core courses are required by other programs)	Minimal evidence that the program core courses are required by other programs (25% or less program core courses are required by other programs)	Insufficient evidence that the program core courses are required by other programs (No program core courses are required by other programs)

Criterion 4				
Quality of Program Inputs/Resources and Processes:				
This criterion allows the program to describe the quality of its resources and processes				
	3	2	1	0
Non-Academic Support ONLY: 1) Describe how the program is delivering services	Strong evidence program is delivering quality services relevant to its resources and processes	Moderate evidence program is delivering quality services relevant to its resources and processes	Minimal evidence program is delivering quality services relevant to its resources and processes	Insufficient evidence program is delivering quality services relevant to its resources and processes
Course type Academic ONLY	Program core courses are offered through 5 or more different modalities/types	Program core courses are offered through 3-4 different modalities/types	Program core courses are offered through 2 different modalities/types	Program core courses are offered through only 1 modality/type
Academic ONLY Average student (course) completion rate over three years	Average student (course) completion rate exceeds institutional average (>61%)	Average student (course) completion rate meets institutional average (60% to 50%)	Average student completion rate falls below institutional average (49% to 40%)	Average student completion rate falls significantly below institutional average (<40%)
2) Faculty/staff knowledge, experience and training (average # of years of all faculty/staff in program area)	10 or more years of experience related to field/content area	5-9 years of experience related to content area	1-4 years of experience related to content area	Less than 1 full year of experience related to content area
Academic only 3) Percentage of FT/PT (PT includes any faculty/staff that teaches program courses for additional compensation) faculty	60% or more of faculty are full-time	40-59% of faculty are full-time	25-39% are full time faculty	Less than 25% are full time faculty

Criterion 5				
Quality of Program Outputs:				
	3	2	1	0
Non-Academic Support Only: 1) Describe how program supports student retention and graduation	Evidence program demonstrates a strong impact on student retention and graduation	Evidence program demonstrates a moderate impact on student retention and graduation	Evidence program demonstrates minimal impact on student retention and graduation	Insufficient evidence program impacts student retention and graduation
Non-Academic Support Only: 2) Evidence of performance based on continuous improvement data (i.e., workplan accomplishments, evaluations, surveys, meeting minutes, anecdotal stories of success, awards/ recognition, media coverage, etc.)	Evidence of improved program performance based on continuous improvement data (4 or more specific examples or data sources)	Evidence of improved program performance based on continuous improvement data (2-3 specific examples or data sources)	Evidence of improved program performance based on continuous improvement data (1 specific example or data source)	Insufficient evidence of improved program performance based on continuous improvement data
Academic Only: 1) Student retention rates	Average student retention rate exceeds institutional average (>47%)	Average student retention rate is between 47% and 42%	Average student retention rate is between 41.9% to 36%	Average student retention rate falls below 35.9%

Criterion 5 cont'd Quality of Program Outputs:				
Academic Only: 2) Average # of quarters to completion	2 year degree: Students complete degree in 9 quarters or less (150%) 4 year degree: Students complete degree in 18 quarters or less (150%)	2 year degree: Students complete degree in 12 quarters or less 4 year degree: Students complete degree in 21 quarters or less	2 year degree: Students complete degree in 15 quarters or less 4 year degree: Students complete degree in 24 quarters or less	2 year degree: Students complete degree in 18 quarters or more 4 year degree: Students complete degree in 27 quarters or more
Academic Only: 3) Evidence of improvement in student learning and outcomes as a result of assessment of program outcomes	Strong evidence that program goals for improvement in student learning are being measured and action steps have been implemented	Moderate evidence that program goals for improvement in student learning are being measured and action steps have been implemented	Minimal evidence that program goals for improvement in student learning are being measured and action steps have been implemented	Insufficient evidence that program goals for improvement in student learning are being measured and action steps implemented

Criterion 6				
Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program				
	3	2	1	0
1) Program participation and number of student or client contacts	Increased number of enrolled students or client contacts in past three years	Leveled number of enrolled students or client contacts in past three years	Decreased number of enrolled students or client contacts in past three years	Insufficient evidence of enrolled students or client contacts in past three years
1) Factors that have contributed to the program growth or decline (e.g. increase or decrease in staff/duties)	Narrative response only			
Academics ONLY: 2) Number of additional students who could be served by program without increasing staff	Evidence that an average of 0-6 additional students could be served by the program without increasing staff.	Evidence that an average of 7-12 additional students could be served by the program without increasing staff.	Evidence that an average of 13-20 additional students could be served by the program without increasing staff.	More than 21 additional students could be served by the program without increasing staff
Non-Academic Support ONLY: 3) Number of additional clients who could be served by program without increasing staff	Evidence that 0-10 additional clients could be served by the program without increasing staff.	Evidence that 11-20 additional clients could be served by the program without increasing staff.	Evidence that an average of 21-30 additional clients could be served by the program without increasing staff.	More than 31 additional clients could be served by the program without increasing staff.

Criterion 7				
Revenue and Other Resources Generated				
	3	2	1	0
1) Document tuition and non-tuition based resources and indirect revenue over the past three years	Increased level of tuition and non-tuition based resources and indirect revenue over three years	Leveled tuition and non-tuition based resources and indirect revenue over three years	Decreased tuition and non-tuition resources and indirect revenue over three years	Insufficient evidence of revenue and resources generated over three years
2) Evidence of other resources generated (e.g. MOUs, contract agreements, etc...)	Strong evidence of other resources generated by program (4 or more specific examples or data sources)	Moderate evidence of other resources generated by program (2-3 specific examples or data sources)	Minimal evidence of other resources generated by program (1 specific example or data source)	Insufficient evidence of other resources generated by program

Criterion 8				
Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program				
	3	2	1	0
1) Program costs compared with projected annual budget over three years	Program has exceeded projected annual budget by 0% - 2.50%	Program has exceeded projected annual budget by 2.51%-5.0%	Program has exceeded projected annual budget by 5.1%-7.50%	Program has exceeded projected annual budget by 7.51% or higher
2) Proposed cost reduction while maintaining the current quality of program services (utilizing existing staff and resources)	Evidence that program can reduce costs by 5% or higher	Evidence that program can reduce costs by 3%-4.9%	Evidence that program can reduce costs by 2.9% or less	Insufficient evidence that program can reduce costs

Criterion 9				
Impact Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program				
	3	2	1	0
1) Evidence program work plans connects to the strategic plan (brief narrative)	Evidence that work plans have strong connection to strategic plan (3 or more examples or activities)	Evidence that work plans have moderate connection to strategic plan (2 examples or activities)	Evidence that work plans have minimal connection to strategic plan (1 example or activity)	Insufficient evidence of work plan connection with the strategic plan
2) Describe how your program has enhanced students' cultural values and life skills	Program has demonstrated how it has enhanced students cultural values and life skills in 3 or more ways	Program has demonstrated how it has enhanced students cultural values and life skills in 2 ways	Program has demonstrated how it has enhanced students cultural values and life skills in 1 way	Insufficient evidence program has enhanced students cultural values and life skills
3) Describe any challenges your program is working to overcome to achieve its goals	Program has demonstrated it is working to overcome 3 challenges	Program has demonstrated it is working to overcome 2 challenges	Program has demonstrated it is working to overcome 1 challenge	Insufficient evidence program is working to overcome challenges

Criterion 10				
Opportunity Analysis of Program				
	3	2	1	0
1) Describe how the program could be enhanced or strengthened	Program has described how it could be enhanced or strengthened in 3 or more ways	Program has described how it could be enhanced or strengthened in 2 ways	Program has described how it could be enhanced or strengthened in at least 1 way	Insufficient description provided
2) Describe how this program is prepared to transform in new and innovative ways	Program has described in 3 or more action steps how it is prepared to transform in new and innovative ways	Program has described in at least 2 action steps how it is prepared to transform in new and innovative ways	Program has described in at least 1 action step how it is prepared to transform in new and innovative ways	Insufficient description how program is prepared to transform in new and innovative ways
3) Describe the future outlook (i.e. program improvement, increased enrollment, retention, participation, career opportunities, graduation)	Strong evidence program outlook has positive impact or outcomes	Moderate evidence program outlook has positive impact or outcomes	Minimal evidence program outlook has positive impact or outcomes	Insufficient evidence program outlook has positive impact or outcomes