RACEA Task Force 1 has been working to take the BoR policy statements regarding Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) and develop processes and tools to support the periodic review and analysis of each institutions CPR website. Our intent throughout our work is to build a peer-driven process that yields useful feedback to each institution. In particular, we want the process to produce helpful guidance for institutions that could improve their own CPR processes.

We have developed a draft rubric that would be used by peers in analyzing the CPR policies, processes, and reports of institutions. We have field tested the rubric this summer using two volunteer institutions and the task force members as analysts and will be presenting on that at the RACEA annual meeting.

For the current year, we need to conduct a pilot test of the rubric and the overall analysis process that we have drafted. Volunteers will have the opportunity to influence the final process and tools that will be used going forward.

We are seeking volunteer institutions whose CPR sites will serve as the pilot sites for the first round of peer analysis. We need a total of seven institutional volunteers distributed as follows:

Research/Regional Universities	1
State Universities	3
State Colleges/2Yr Colleges	3

The responsibility of each institution will be to provide the task force with the url and login information for the institution's CPR site. This will be given to three (3) peer analysts and one (1) person from the system office. They will access the site and review the institution's CPR policy and process documents, timeline, and a selection of the program reports on the site. For smaller institutions, all program reports are likely to be read; for very large institutions it may be a subset.

The three analysts will meet, either in person or in a conference call, and discuss their individual ratings. They will then draft a single summary report that includes a summary sheet, recommendations and a copy of the rubric.

For this pilot year, this will be followed by some discussion involving an institutional representative, the peer analysts, a task force member, and a system office member. The purpose of this discussion would be twofold: (a) to review the findings and the rubric, with the goal of improving the language in the rubric and (b) to get input from institutions on the format and type of feedback that would be most useful. **Thus, those who volunteer this year will get feedback on their CPR processes AND an opportunity to influence the process going forward.**

Once fully implemented, we recommend that the remainder of the process be as follows:
- Analysts' report goes to system office.
- System officer looks at institutional site as part of its own review of report (due diligence)

- Discussion with analysts if system needs clarification
- System attaches cover letter and forwards report to institution
- IF analysis and system office recommend actions in response to report, system cover letter includes direction (particularly when institution is Emergent)
- System and analysts respond to institutional follow-up questions (requires maintaining record of who does what).