1. **Role and Mission**

Is the program consistent with the role and mission of MSCD?

*Yes. The program has enthusiastic and talented faculty who are dedicated to providing a high-quality educational experience for their students. The program is substantially applied, field-oriented, and interdisciplinary, emphasizing the societal relevance of coursework to the Denver metropolitan area and elsewhere.*

2. **Curriculum**

a. Is the core curriculum appropriate? If not, why not?

*Yes, the core curriculum is appropriate; however, after talking with the faculty, I think it would be appropriate to revise “Introduction to Planning” to “Introduction to Land Use,” and in the revised course emphasize overarching themes of land use to be revisited and reinforced in later coursework.*

*Additionally, I would recommend having a single capstone experience at the end of the curriculum to accommodate students from all three (rather than four, see below) concentrations. A single capstone would help unify the curriculum. Students in each concentration would benefit from the perspectives of their colleagues in other concentrations. This course could be team-taught by faculty from different concentrations.*

*Furthermore, a single capstone would streamline program assessment. With this single course, which draws upon learning experiences through the entire curriculum, faculty could assess four to five program-level learning outcomes, such as capability to: statistically analyze data; portray data in maps; give oral presentations; conceive research plans; and write research reports. For each program-level learning outcome, faculty could use a rubric to rate various elements of the outcome. Below is an example for oral presentations, in the context of presenting a research plan. Both faculty and students (peers of the presenter) could use the form (or some other rubric) to evaluate a presentation:*
|                                    | clear | somewhat clear | somewhat unclear | unclear |
|------------------------------------|------|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| Research problem was:             |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| Significance of the problem was:  |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| Background information was:       |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|too detailed or insufficient |
| Proposed methods were:            |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| Conclusions were:                |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|poor/absent |
| Presentation was organized:      |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| Presenter speaking style was:     |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|too soft or difficult to follow |not clear and difficult to follow |
| PowerPoint supported presenter’s information: |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| Presentation held my interest:    |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|not at all |
| **Overall**                       |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| This project should be given priority for funding. |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| This project should be funded, but is in the second tier for funding priority. |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| The author should rewrite and resubmit the proposal for the next funding round. |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|
| This project should not be funded. |      |~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~|

Please provide comments for the presenter (e.g., what worked well, what could be improved):
b. Do the service courses meet the needs of the audiences for whom they are intended?

Yes; however, it would be helpful if Land Use students could double-count some courses toward both the major and the general education requirement (e.g., social science or natural science areas of the curriculum). Other universities allow this, and it would help expedite graduation as well as extend university resources.

c. Are the elective courses current and useful?

Yes; however, it is important that the faculty get together and: (1) archive or delete any courses in the catalog that won’t be offered in the foreseeable future; and (2) develop a “scheduling chart” for the electives so that students can plan accordingly. Currently, students are forced to take many electives based upon what happens to be available when they need to take them, without the advantage of being able to plan ahead to take what best suits their degree plan. Apparently, a previous seven-year scheduling chart expired, and a new one has not yet been created. With regard to item (1), having courses in the catalog that have not, and will not likely, be offered in the foreseeable future creates confusion for students. Thus, the department needs to do some “house cleaning.”

d. Are the educational goals (desired student outcomes or competencies) that the program has for its students clear and reasonable?

Yes, but they are unnecessarily complicated and inconsistent. For example, based upon the program review packet that I received, the GIS concentration has numerous detailed outcomes, whereas the other concentrations have more work to do in this area. A single set of consistent learning outcomes (e.g., see above) for the entire program would probably be more appealing to an accreditation agency (based on my own experience), as well as less work for the faculty.

e. Are there areas of emphasis that should be developed by the program to meet future needs?

Yes. I recommend that the program develop a strong, clear emphasis in sustainability; this is one of the hottest topics in modern higher education, and the program is ideally positioned to move in this direction.

f. Should certain areas of emphasis be given low priority or discontinued? Explain why.
No. The surveying component of the curriculum, currently an area of interest under the GIS concentration, could become more attractive as older members of that profession begin to retire (and thus increase demand for new surveyors). The average age of surveyors is approximately 58 years, so presumably demand for surveyors will begin to increase in the near future. Surveying and GIS are synergistic, but by no means redundant. The online nature of the surveying courses in this program also offers great scheduling flexibility and enrollment potential.

Is any overlap or duplication that exists between departments, institutes, disciplines, and programs appropriate and has it been explained or justified?

There is some redundancy within the department, in that “geology” appears as a concentration under the Land Use program, as well as the Environmental Science program. Additionally, “environment” appears in one concentration under the Land Use program, and also in the title of another program (Environmental Science) in the department. This structure is slightly awkward and somewhat problematic for students. For example, the more rigorous geology concentration (with more coursework in geology, as well as prerequisite math, chemistry, and physics) is embedded in the Environmental Science program; thus, students interested in majoring in geology ought to be pursuing the geology concentration under Environmental Science. However, many “geology” students are in the geology concentration under Land Use.

I recommend restructuring the concentrations under Land Use as follows: (1) Planning and Resource Management; (2) GIS; and (3) Earth Science. This restructuring addresses confusing wording redundancy, consolidates two current concentrations into one to balance/optimize resources, and makes clear that the third concentration is rooted in physical geography as it relates to land use, as opposed to the separate discipline of geology.

With this restructuring, area (1) should have an enrollment comparable to area (2), which is already popular. Moreover, area (1) will be ideally positioned to develop an emphasis in sustainability, as well as a comprehensive approach to resource management and planning at multiple scales (urban and regional), which is important for addressing land use problems faced in modern society. There is already considerable synergy between the two existing concentrations that would be consolidated into area (1), which has existing strengths in mitigation planning for natural disasters, traditional urban planning, and resource management, including international perspective, among others.

Additionally, such restructuring may enable the department to develop a niche in Environmental Geology, where much of the employment in geology is concentrated. Such a niche could distinguish this program from other, more conventional, geology programs in the region.
I further recommend that each of the three concentrations be assigned a faculty director, who has the authority to convene committees to periodically review the curriculum and recommend changes to the department. Currently, leadership of each concentration seems informal and voluntary. A more formalized leadership structure should facilitate periodic review and better engage the faculty.

Curriculum reflection with appropriate changes should take place at least once per year, perhaps in an annual mini-retreat held somewhere on campus. A retreat would also help develop a sense of “community” among the various full-time faculty, adjuncts, and staff who contribute to the department. For example, this retreat could be half a day and take place the week following spring graduation.

h. Are there any anomalies in the distribution of grades?

Grades are generally higher in the internship courses; however, that is not unusual. I do think that the evaluation of interns should be formalized. For example, have the interns collect a portfolio of samples of their work as they conduct their jobs. Also obtain a letter of evaluation from the student’s immediate supervisor. At the end of the semester, interview the student, going over the above materials in the process. These steps could be the basis for a more formal evaluation and grade assignment.

i. Are courses scheduled at times, locations, and frequencies that are consistent with the objectives of the program?

Yes, with the exception of some electives (see above). For the required courses, the faculty have already worked out a scheduling plan that conforms well to classroom and university constraints. There are also a couple of online courses available through the Land Use program, mainly for general studies, that circumvent the problem of room scheduling.

One problem is that the program is not routinely enforcing prerequisites for upper-level courses. This problem should be rectified through coordination between the department and administration. Apparently, the registration system (Banner) can accommodate prerequisites, and this capability should be exploited. Otherwise, instructors will continue to face the challenge of teaching to audiences with mixed preparation, and students who are well prepared will not receive as good an educational experience as they would have received. For example, cartography should be routinely required (and enforced) for upper-level courses.

j. How does the curriculum of this program compare with similar programs at comparable institutions?
In fact, I can’t think of a program quite like this one. It was interdisciplinary from its inception, whereas many universities are scrambling to jump on board the “interdisciplinary bandwagon” by combining traditionally disparate disciplines. It may have been fortuitous that the Land Use program evolved the way it did, as interdisciplinary research and education is highly valued in modern higher education and society. The curriculum has great breadth considering the limited number of faculty who teach in the Land Use program. Overall, it is an excellent program.

3. Students and Student Satisfaction

Based on the data provided, consider the program’s effectiveness when evaluated with respect to the:

a. number of degrees awarded

Apparently, the program is graduating about 32 students per year and has about 190 majors (in 2009). This rate of graduation seems appropriate considering that many students take classes part-time because they are working while attending the university. Perhaps the graduation rate could be increased with the scheduling adjustments noted above and advising adjustments noted below.

b. number of courses offered

The program is outstanding in breadth of coverage and course offerings, as noted above. I recommend that the following changes be made to help modernize the curriculum.

(1) The “Stratigraphy and Structure” course should be split into two separate courses.

(2) The “Mineralogy and Petrology” course should be split into two separate courses, and possibly even more if/when resources become available.

(3) A comprehensive geologic mapping course should be added to the geology curriculum; existing 1- or 2-hour field courses that focus on particular locations, with some modest mapping activities, could be consolidated into a comprehensive 3-hour or 6-hour mapping course. Eventually, this course (ideally offered in the summer) could attract students from outside the university as well as MSCD. For example, the existing core under the Environmental Science program could be revised to require an environmental field methods course OR geologic mapping.

(4) A GIS programming course should be added to the GIS concentration. While students may currently pursue programming in the Computer Science department, they are not experiencing programming within a GIS context. GIS programming is an increasingly important skill for graduates to have in order to advance through the GIS profession.
That is, the market is increasingly flooded with graduates having lower-level GIS skills; to gain a competitive edge, graduates need as many advanced skills as a program can reasonably offer.

I should note that the Land Use program already DOES offer advanced courses in GIS, such as spatial databases among others; a GIS programming addition would enhance the already strong GIS concentration. Furthermore, I note that the GIS concentration prepares students for employment in public and private sectors of the workforce, and it is popular within and outside the region. Students in the program have won competitive scholarships from professional organizations such as GITA and ASPRS; such accomplishments speak highly of the program.

(5) The current “jump” from introductory GIS to the upper-level GIS courses is too large; this sentiment was echoed by students and faculty. The department is already contemplating a fix for this problem. It appears that revising the map use course to include a GPS component and an introductory GIS component (thus making it suitable as an introduction for non-majors) would facilitate making the regular introductory GIS course more rigorous, adequately preparing students for the upper-level courses. This fix seems logical.

(6) An AutoCAD course would be another good addition to the GIS curriculum, especially for students who may go into environmental consulting, the oil/gas industry, or surveying. Alternatively, there may be a suitable course that students could take from another department at MSCD.

(7) A course focusing on sustainable development in mountain communities (tourism, natural resources, and so on) would be an outstanding addition to the Planning and Resource Management concentration.

(8) In order to accommodate new courses, as well as restructuring of concentrations noted above, the faculty should carefully examine existing courses and look for opportunities to delete those that are not critical, revise them into one or more of the courses noted above, or combine them with other courses, retaining the essential elements.

c. FTE student enrollments

The program is above the college average in terms of students per course; it is doing fine in this regard. I was very impressed by the 60-student cap on all courses at MSCD. Few universities of this size can boast such a cap. At my own institution, we routinely deal with lower-level class sizes of 120 or more – not an ideal environment for learning. Smaller classes enable faculty to create active learning environments and better assess learning, such as using essay questions in lower-level courses. I observed three different
classroom sessions; all three featured ample interaction between students and faculty, and students with each other (peer learning).

d. credit hours generated

Again, the department is above the college average and doing well in this regard.

e. average class size by level of course

Apparently, the average class size in the department is around 27, somewhat (and appropriately) lower in senior-level courses, and somewhat (and appropriately) higher in general education courses. This distribution of class sizes seems ideal.

f. Number of degree recipients who continue their formal lecture (masters, doctorate, professional degree)

I did not receive an explicit figure here, but gather that the number is fairly low. However, that is to be expected given the mission of the university and program.

Based on the information provided:

g. Does the assessment plan devised by the program faculty have the potential for effectively determining if students have achieved the desired competencies?

Yes, but it could be streamlined (less work for faculty) and improved, as noted above.

h. Does a review of the assessment results indicate that students have obtained those competencies?

Overall, yes. The data do not indicate 100% success, but if they did, that would indicate the assessment is too soft. The percentage success distribution looks reasonable. Reasonable figures allow for reflection and improvement, enabling the faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of changes over time.

i. Are program faculty making effective use of the information gained from assessment activities?

Yes, but perhaps not uniformly across the program. For example, from the program review packet, it appears that the GIS concentration has done a little more work in this regard than the other concentrations. The faculty do seem to reflect upon student feedback and outcomes and then adjust the curriculum accordingly. A number of changes are already in the works. A uniform assessment tool as noted above would be appropriate.
j. What changes, if any, should be made in the assessment plan?

*It should be condensed and made uniform for the program as a whole, as noted above.*

Based on the information provided, do students in the program and graduates of the program:

k. seem satisfied?

Yes, I interviewed several students and generally they seemed satisfied. They requested course adjustments as noted above, as well as a scheduling chart in order to plan ahead. They liked the formal and informal interaction with faculty, the feeling of a sense of home/place in the department, the true interdisciplinary experience they get in this program, the breadth of coursework and capability to design a degree plan meeting their educational objectives, the relatively small class sizes, and the overall congenial character of the program.

Students also appreciated the capability to choose a faculty advisor from a list of choices within each concentration. This seems like an appropriate strategy; however, the department should take steps to ensure that one individual does not bear a disproportionate advising load based upon popularity. Additionally, it would be helpful to post a list of advisors, their office hours, and their e-mail addresses on a large poster in the main office, so that students can plan their consultations. Given the extended nature of this degree program, it is critical that students begin a relationship with a faculty advisor early and visit them frequently, at least once per semester. Currently, it seems there is no requirement that students seek advising; this problem should be rectified to facilitate appropriate degree plans and expedite graduation.

From the program review packet, it appears that graduates of the Land Use program responded less favorably than graduates of other programs at MSCD on information they received about careers, preparation for work, and preparation for graduate school. In order to better determine what Land Use instructional and advising approaches are helping students, as well as any specific suggestions students may have for improving their experience, I strongly recommend that the program conduct exit interviews with its seniors in their final semester. This should not be too difficult, as students in the capstone course and others immediately preceding their graduation could be interviewed in a group format by the department chair and directors of the concentrations.

I understand that the department’s chapter of Gamma Theta Upsilon, the geographical honor society for students, has been revived. I encourage continued efforts in this regard, to recognize students who have excelled in the program. It would also be appropriate to hold an annual student awards ceremony, perhaps on a Friday afternoon
near the end of the spring semester, to recognize students who have done well in the program. For example, awards could be given to the most outstanding student(s) in each concentration in the department, as well as all students who have achieved a certain GPA. Awards could include scholarships (initially, perhaps a few hundred dollars, from the department’s endowment), as well as plaques or certificates. This ceremony would also help reinforce a sense of community within the department.

I. perceive that they were prepared for graduate or professional school?

Only one student whom I interviewed was strongly considering graduate school. She was in the geology concentration and probably should have taken the more rigorous geology concentration offered through the Environmental Science program. The restructuring mentioned above would address this problem.

m. obtain suitable employment?

From the review packet, it looks like the employment rate may be around 87%. I consider that figure very good considering the current/recent state of the economy. One student whom I interviewed was still trying to find a job, but she only completed the certificate in GIS and obtained her degree from another department. This student suggested that an internship may have helped her in a competitive job market. I am inclined to agree and recommend that the university provide a mechanism for certificate-only students to have access to internships, as resources permit.

Internships are an important element of the curriculum and students consistently expressed the value of their internship experience. Field experiences are another strong element of the program; faculty routinely, and appropriately, take advantage of the outstanding location of the campus, next to an urban laboratory in the form of downtown Denver. Examples include taking students on field trips to governmental agencies and utilizing the Platte River that flows through the city for hydrological measurements.

4. Faculty

a. Are the areas of faculty specialization and competence appropriate for the program? Are other specialties needed?

Overall, yes. In fact, the faculty are quite versatile and enthusiastic about teaching. In many ways, they are ideally suited to this program, which covers a lot of ground. I recommend that the next hire in this program be a human geographer with expertise in regional planning, natural resources, and sustainable development. Such a hire would help balance out expertise within the department; currently, the physical side of the
discipline has more representation than the social side. However, both physical and social sciences are necessary for a comprehensive treatment of land use.

Many of the faculty have professional experience outside of academia, thus bringing valuable applied perspective to their instruction.

b. Is the use of part-time faculty appropriate?

Yes; however, the department has about twice as many adjuncts as full-time faculty. This situation is not ideal, but the quality of the adjuncts seems high. In fact, the department has been able to hire some of these more exceptional adjunct faculty as full-time faculty. I’m not surprised by the number of part-time faculty considering current budgetary constraints.

Based on the information provided, evaluate the faculty collectively with respect to:

c. their interest in curriculum revision.

It varies within the program, but is generally good. The GIS concentration seems a little more active in this regard, but all of the faculty seemed engaged and open-minded, and they embraced the process of program assessment. They seem very open to making changes as appropriate.

d. their professional development and scholarship including research in support of teaching and learning.

Despite heavy course loads, the faculty are keeping up with developments in their respective fields by attending professional conferences, working with professional organizations, forming informal alliances with academics and practitioners in the region, and conducting research. The level of scholarship (peer reviewed publication and external funding) is not high (with a few exceptions) relative to research universities, but that is to be expected considering that teaching takes up a substantial portion of faculty time at MSCD. Everyone I interviewed seemed committed to teaching and enjoyed working with students.

The faculty are entrepreneurial and have effectively utilized contacts with industry to acquire excellent equipment that they intend to use in support of learning. For example, a scanning electron microscope (SEM) and x-ray diffraction device (XRD) are exceptional learning tools available in the geology concentration at MSCD. Working with MSCD’s center for innovation, faculty are also embarking upon a revenue generating initiative involving the sale of rock and mineral kits. Such entrepreneurship should be embraced in this difficult budgetary climate.
e. their service to MSCD and professionally-related public service.

Faculty are doing fine in this regard. I was especially impressed that they co-hosted THE major conference in geography (annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers) a few years ago. This conference was a major, and successful, undertaking by MSCD and other universities in the region. Program faculty are also involved in public service aimed at educating the local community in GIS and land use. The faculty have also attended conferences to improve assessment protocols and education.

The Land Use program is a valuable component of MSCD, for example, in terms of the large number of general education courses it offers and consistently high credit-hour generation, among other qualities.

f. their participation in professional organizations.

The faculty are active in professional organizations, such as the AAG as noted above and other organizations suited to their respective fields.

g. the distribution of their effort related to instruction, professional development, and service.

The tenured/tenure-track faculty contribute 50% of their workload to teaching and the remainder to service and professional development. This breakdown is appropriate given the teaching emphasis of the university. I was somewhat surprised to learn that a 4-4 teaching load only translates to 50% of the total workload; at my institution it would be closer to 80%. It was also unclear to me why four courses constitute a 100% effort for visiting faculty, but only a 50% effort for tenured/tenure-track faculty; there is a possible inconsistency in workload definitions between faculty categories.

The department chair has outstanding knowledge of the workings of the university and department. It’s unclear how long he intends to remain chair, but it would be appropriate for the faculty to get together to develop a succession plan so that there is a seamless transition if/when the chair decides to step down in the future.

h. the number of grants applied for, received, and the amount received.

Overall, this figure is not high (though one or two of the faculty seemed fairly active in this regard). However, I would not expect it to be high considering the effort expended on teaching. It is reasonable given the workload breakdown.

i. the diversity of their academic backgrounds.
The faculty have extremely diverse backgrounds, absolutely essential to covering the wide breadth of courses offered in this program. Their ability to handle diverse coursework rates much higher than faculty at most universities.

5. Resources/Institutional Support

a. Are resources adequate for achieving the goals and objectives of the program? Consider the facilities, capital equipment, operating expenses, office, laboratory, classroom, and other instructional space, library, number of faculty, support staff, and other resources.

Overall, the resources are very good. The faculty are generally pleased with their location in the recently renovated Science Building. The classrooms, labs, and instructional equipment are very good. However, the faculty conference room is too small given the number of faculty, so on occasion they may need to meet in a lab, but that is not a big problem. Also, AHET is apparently slow in responding to equipment failures such as bulbs in computer projectors. If the response time could be improved, that would help maintain a high-quality educational experience for the students. Additionally, one faculty member mentioned that the lights are always on in the conference room; this problem should be rectified, because it is wasting energy.

The biggest resource problems appear to be insufficient front office staff and lab support (in that order). One front office staff for a department of this size is inadequate. For example, my own department has about half as many majors and two front office staff, and we need more support! The Land Use faculty seem able and willing to maintain the GIS and geology labs; however, some formal support would be valuable, enabling the faculty to spend more time on instructional development and research. Many universities have staff support for such labs, which are not simple to maintain.

b. Does the review indicate that the program should be expanded, sustained at the same level, or contracted?

It should be expanded with the acquisition of additional faculty and staff. I think the hiring priority for faculty should be: (1) a human geographer as noted above; and (2) another geologist to facilitate expansion of that curriculum. The hiring priority for staff should be: (1) another front office assistant; and (2) lab assistants. Having gone through program reviews before, I realize that practically every one of them recommends additional resources; however, I genuinely believe that the lack of personnel noted above, especially only one front office assistant, is problematic.

c. Are there initiatives and improvements that faculty and administrators should be making?
The faculty should capitalize on the sustainability initiative noted above, and administrators could perhaps take steps to rectify problems like not allowing double-counting and full access to the internship office, as well as the need for additional resources noted above. Granted, there are no easy fixes in this unprecedented budgetary climate, and many programs face similar shortages.

It would be appropriate to “spice up” the departmental web page to excite visitors and increase the pool of majors. The current web page is satisfactory but a little bland. It conveys essential information, but could be enhanced, for example, by including: (1) faculty and alumni profiles; (2) a list of alumni and where they are working; and (3) quotes from current students and alumni conveying the value of the program.

In general, the department could take further steps to better engage the alumni. Such engagement could result in more internship and employment opportunities for current students, as well as possible donations to the program. I recommend honoring a member of the alumni each year at the aforementioned awards banquet; periodically inviting alumni to give presentations in current courses, so that students can see there is light at the end of the tunnel, the relevance of coursework, and real employment possibilities; and developing a departmental newsletter to be circulated to the administration, students, and alumni. Each issue could feature one or more alumni as well as happenings in the department. Further, a newsletter would be an opportunity to periodically poll the alumni for feedback or suggestions, for example, on the need to alter the curriculum to better reflect trends in the job market. This newsletter could be distributed electronically and also featured on a departmental Facebook page.

d. Could the program be more effective if its place in the organizational structure of the school or college were changed, e.g., if it were in a different department?

No, it is in the right place. It just needs to undertake a modest revision of its own structure, as noted above.
Please rate the following aspects of the program by placing an X in the appropriate box. It would be most helpful if you also provide a short rationale for your rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Substantially below average</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>Substantially above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The perceived quality of the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perceived quality of the facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perceived quality of the program faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the program to general education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the program as a support for, or as an integral part of, other programs offered by MSCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the program to the region, the state, or the DMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future potential of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perceived quality of the curriculum</td>
<td>Good breadth, but could benefit from some modest restructuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perceived quality of the facilities</td>
<td>Newly renovated building and high-end instructional equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perceived quality of the program faculty</td>
<td>Extremely versatile and dedicated to high-quality teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the program to general education</td>
<td>Offers numerous such courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the program as a support for, or as an integral part of, other programs offered by MSCD</td>
<td>Collaborates with others, especially GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the program to the region, the state, or the DMA</td>
<td>Wise land use is crucial in this growing region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future potential of the program</td>
<td>Ideally positioned to develop an expertise in sustainability and environmental geology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>