

APPENDIX A: DEGREE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CHART

Directions: For each system or feature in the left hand column, assess where your program would currently fall in the four columns to the right.

System or feature/degree of development	Fully developed/ Present throughout program 3 pts.	Fully developed in part of program/ Somewhat developed throughout 2 pts.	Somewhat developed in part of program 1 pts.	Inactive throughout/ Inchoate in part or throughout 0 pts.
Ongoing curriculum development informed by regular program assessment and professional development				
Ongoing formative program assessment that informs curriculum development and professional development				
Ongoing professional development in the discipline that informs curriculum development and program assessment				
Ongoing leadership that is informed by and informs the faculty, that is flexible and attuned to local histories, constraints, and opportunities				
Strong sense of community and inclusion among faculty of all ranks, high degree of participation in program-building activities				
YOUR PROGRAM SCORES: Total of the column				
YOUR PROGRAM TOTAL (add the column totals): _____	Highly developed 12-15	Developed 9-11	Marginally developed 5-8	Undeveloped/ Inactive 0-5

APPENDIX B: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTORS

Scores	Program descriptions
Highly Developed 12-15	A highly developed program includes systems that interact with each other, inform each other, and constantly evolve. These systems provide a means of developing an effective curriculum based on the latest research in the field filtered through active teacher-scholars and assessing that curriculum at the course and program level; results of the assessment and developments in the field made relevant to the program via faculty professional development inform the curriculum as well as the assessment and professional development activities. Participation in these activity systems create a shared sense of purpose and community that crosses ranks and gives rise to communities of practice wherein “leadership,” regardless of title or position, is flexible and responsive to faculty, program, and institutional histories, constraints, and needs.
Developed 9-11	A developed program has many if not all of the same features as a highly developed program though only partially implemented. For example, a developed program may have an evolving curriculum that is updated and revised often but not necessarily as a result of careful program assessment. A developed program may have excellent faculty development, for example, filling the need for faculty to learn more about basic writing pedagogy or online teaching, but this development is more ad hoc rather than systemic (however well a particular ad hoc system works). Leadership may or may not be “official,” but it works at various times in various places but may be vaguely developed or somewhat of a contentious issue. The sense of community is strong though not shared by all.
Marginally Developed 5-8	A marginally developed program may share some or most of the features of a highly developed program, but rarely are all the different systems present, or if they are, they are situated in different parts of the program. For example, “program assessment” may be relegated to basic writing and not permeate college-level writing. Or faculty development may be limited to full-time faculty. Or curriculum development may be “top down” with little input from the majority (perhaps adjunct) faculty. Likewise, leadership, however well intentioned, may not be responsive to the majority of faculty but rather operate in more of a boss-worker relationship. Still, some curriculum development, some professional development, and some program assessment gets done—but a marginally developed program is hit and miss and inconsistent.
Undeveloped/ Inactive 0-4	An undeveloped or inactive program has some, few, or none of the features of a highly developed program. There may be efforts toward developing a shared curriculum, haphazard efforts to create faculty development opportunities, and some program assessment, though the latter may tend to be top-down, run by “administration” rather than program faculty. There’s little sense of faculty buy-in—there may actually be a large divide among the faculty (adjunct faculty, for instance, having little contact with full-time faculty, having few or no opportunities to participate in assessment or curriculum design). Leadership, when it’s present, may at times be reflexive but may provide little more than administrative task fulfillment (scheduling, staffing, etc.).