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Resource Binder
MARK YOUR CALENDARS
2017-2018 EDUCATIONAL WORKSHOPS

WASC Senior College and University Commission is pleased to announce a selection of educational programs for 2017-18. Developed by regional and national experts, they cover topics of vital interest to all higher educational institutions – and particularly to those in the WSCUC region. They are entirely optional, but our hope is that member institutions will find them of service. WSCUC staff will be present at each session to answer any questions related specifically to WSCUC accreditation expectations.

★ Assessment 101: Meaningful Assessment for Student Learning
   October 26, 2017. Mills College, Oakland, CA

★ Analytics for Academics: Producing Actionable Information about Students and Learning to Improve Effectiveness
   October 27, 2017. Mills College, Oakland, CA

★ NEW! The Learning Institution: Aligning and Integrating Practices to Support Quality
   November 15, 2017. University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

★ NEW! Program Review: Comprehensive and Sustainable Approaches for Educational Effectiveness
   November 16, 2017. University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

★ President/Trustee Retreats
   December 7, 2017. Woodbury University, Burbank, CA
   December 8, 2017. Mills College, Oakland, CA

★ NEW! Assignment Design Charrette
   January 16, 2018. Kellogg West, Pomona, CA

★ Building a Culture of Quality: A Retreat for Institutional Leaders
   January 17, 2018. Kellogg West, Pomona, CA

★ NEW! The Diverse Campus: Intersecting Access and Equity Across the Student Experience
   February 1, 2018. Pitzer College, Claremont, CA

★ Assessment 201: Advanced Topics in Assessment
   February 2, 2018. Pitzer College, Claremont, CA

★ Assessment 101: Meaningful Assessment for Student Learning
   May 17, 2018. Chaminade University - Honolulu, Hawai‘i

★ NEW! The Learning Institution: Aligning and Integrating Practices to Support Quality
   May 18, 2018. Chaminade University - Honolulu, Hawai‘i

Check the WSCUC website for details!
https://www.wascsenior.org/seminars
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Thursday, November 16, 2017
8:30 am – 4:30 pm
University of San Francisco

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

8:00 – 8:30  Arrival, check-in, registration
8:30 – 8:45  Welcome / Introductions
Facilitated by David Chase

8:45 – 10:00 Overview of Program Review Components and Fundamentals
Facilitated by Cyd Jenefsky

10:00 – 10:15 Break

10:15 – 12:00 Key Features and Emergent Trends in Program Review
Facilitated by Cyd Jenefsky

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch

1:00 – 1:30 Frameworks: Holistic Models of Learning, Organizational Cultures, Cultures of Assessment
Facilitated by Carole Huston and Margaret Leary

1:30 – 2:30 Self-studies: Traditional Academic, Student Affairs, non-WSCUC External Accreditors, Online [Application activity]
Facilitated by Margaret Leary and Carole Huston

2:30 – 2:45 Break

2:45—3:30 External and Internal Review Processes: Traditional Academic, Student Affairs, non-WSCUC External Accreditors, Online [Application activity]
Facilitated by Carole Huston and Margaret Leary

3:30 – 4:30 Collaboration: Long-term Planning and Institutional Responses: Traditional Academic, Student Affairs, non-WSCUC External Accreditors, Online [Application activity]
Facilitated by Carole Huston and Margaret Leary

4:30 pm Workshop Conclusion
Program Review:
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Facilitator

Carole L. Huston
Carole L. Huston is an Associate Provost at the University of San Diego, a Professor of Communication Studies, and a consultant for a number of institutions. She has served as USD's ALO and director of the Center for Educational Excellence, and participated inWSCUC accreditation review teams. In her more than 30 years of experience in higher education, Carole has researched and presented on many different facets of learning assessment at AI, AAC&U, AALHE, and WSCUC conferences, including competency assessments in general education, multi-institutional and multi-method assessment projects, integrative learning, program review, and assessing diversity and social justice in faith-based institutions. As an alumna, she currently co-facilitates the WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy and serves as a co-chair of one of WSCUC's Community of Practice institutional teams. Carole has co-authored several articles, books and book chapters on assessment, research methods, interpersonal and intercultural communication, and she contributed to the VALUE rubrics project sponsored by ACC&U.
Email: huston@sandiego.edu

Cyd Jenefsky
Cyd Jenefsky, PhD, is Vice Provost for Strategy and Educational Effectiveness at the University of the Pacific, where she oversees academic strategic planning, academic portfolio development, evaluation of academic quality, and institutional accreditation. She consults widely with universities to assist with strategic planning and organizational development to adapt to the changing landscape of higher education. Her many years of work with the WASC Senior Commission includes serving on review teams, facilitating and mentoring at program review and assessment workshops, serving on the task force on the Changing Ecology of Learning in Higher Education, co-authoring the WSCUC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review, and is currently a member of the Eligibility Review Committee. She previously served as Professor and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at John F. Kennedy University. As a faculty member, she spearheaded university diversity initiatives and designed or directed academic programs in multicultural studies, women’s studies, and social ecology at the University of Georgia and JFKU. She received her BA from UC-Davis and her MA and PhD in Communication Arts from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
Email: cjenefsky@PACIFIC.EDU
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Margaret Leary
Margaret Leary is the Assistant Vice President for Strategic Initiatives and Programs in the Division of Student Affairs at the University of San Diego where she leads assessment and strategic planning efforts for the student affairs division, co-chairs the university’s Student Success Committee, facilitates the development and implementation of first year and transfer learning communities, coordinates student affairs’ partnership with the masters of higher education leadership program and instructs in the program, and supports institutional assessment, planning, and accreditation efforts. She has served on WSCUC accreditation review teams, is an alumna of the WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy, and serves as co-chair of one of WSCUS’s Community of Practice institutional teams. She has presented on a variety of topics related to assessment and student learning at a range of national conferences including the American Educational Research Association, Assessment Institute, ACPA, NASPA, and the WSCUC Academic Resource Conference. She earned a Bachelor of Science in Accountancy and a Master of Science in Counseling from Villanova University. She is currently completing her doctoral degree in Leadership Studies at the University of San Diego. In addition to the University of San Diego, she has experience working in student affairs at Villanova University, University of the Pacific, and Dartmouth College.
Email: margaretleary@sandiego.edu

WSCUC Representative

David Chase
David Chase is the Associate Vice President of Educational Programs at WASC Senior College and University Commission. Prior to joining WSCUC in 2017, David was responsible for leading Academic Affairs at the American Film Institute Conservatory in Los Angeles, California, which included the planning, development, and evaluation the Conservatory’s academic programs and serving as the Accreditation Liaison Officer. David also held the position of Senior Associate Director of Institutional Effectiveness at the University of the Pacific, where he also served as the Assistant Dean of the Conservatory of Music and taught courses in the Music Management program and in the core seminars of Pacific’s General Education program. He earned Bachelor of Music and Master of Arts in Music degrees from Pacific’s Conservatory. David is a co-author of the book Assessment in Creative Disciplines: Quantifying and Qualifying the Aesthetic, and has published and presented workshops on assessing student learning and on teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education arts disciplines. He is a graduate of the third class of WSCUC’s Assessment Leadership Academy.
Email: dchase@wscuc.org
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Workshop Outcomes

MORNING SESSION:

➢ Describe fundamental components of program review process
➢ Explore emergent trends in academic program review
➢ Align program review results with strategic planning & budgeting
Workshop Outcomes

AFTERNOON SESSION:

- Illustrate the uses of strategies, tools, and resources in improving academic and student affairs review processes
- Assess organizational culture and type of partnership between student and academic affairs
- Differentiate different forms of review and develop strategies for tailoring the review process to meet the standards
- Develop and apply a culturally appropriate review process
- Align program review results with strategic planning & budgeting
Reflection on Program Review at your Institution

For each of the workshop’s key concepts, note your current practices, those practices that need development, and the next steps you will take to the process and outcomes of program review at your institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Concept</th>
<th>Current Practices</th>
<th>Practices to be Developed</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Components of Program Review (morning and afternoon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Concept</td>
<td>Current Practices</td>
<td>Practices to be Developed</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Cultural Perspectives and Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning and Resource Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerging Trends in Program Review

Cyd Jenefsky
Overview – Morning Session

**Part I: Program Review Basics**
- Process Overview
- Evidence-Based
- Guiding Questions
- External Review
- Internal Review
- Action Plans
- Follow-up

**Part II: Emergent Trends**
- Overview of Shifts
- Strategic Groupings
- Accessible Data
- Institutional Priorities
- Aggregating Results
- Follow-up Planning & Budgeting

Program Review: Key Features and Emergent Trends

Cyd Jenefsky, Ph.D.
Vice Provost
Strategy & Educational Effectiveness
University of the Pacific
cjenefsky@pacific.edu
PART I:

PROGRAM REVIEW BASICS

Purpose

Tool for periodic analysis
  • of currency, quality, effectiveness, alignment
  • of programs, services and departments

and strategic planning for improvements
Evidence-Based

Evaluate evidence
- Quality
- Currency
- Effectiveness
- Sustainability

Use results
- Inform planning and budgeting; implement changes

Track impact
- Have changes led to program and institutional improvement?

Learning Ecosystem

Inputs Resources

Processes

Outputs & Outcomes
What questions do you want answered about your program/department’s quality, currency, effectiveness, alignment, sustainability?
QUESTIONS THAT MATTER
Samples

• Does your department meet CAS standards?
• Are students in your program becoming effective campus leaders?
• Do your students meet learning outcome standards? What significant trends are indicated in your learning results? In what areas do you need to improve students' learning?
• How satisfied are students with your program’s curriculum, faculty, program administration, general learning environment, campus facilities and student services? How proud are they of your program and the university?
• Is your program attracting, retaining, graduating the mix of students you seek (target markets, demographic mix, qualifications, etc.)?

QUESTIONS THAT MATTER:
Quality, Currency, Effectiveness

Write 2-3 key questions you want to know about your programs/departments
What questions do you think matter to your students?

What data/evidence do you need to see to answer your questions about quality, currency, effectiveness, sustainability?
Typical Program Data: Academic Quality/Effectiveness

- Student profile, selectivity, yield
- Curriculum
- Pedagogies, modalities, HIPs
- Co-curricular integration
- Advising, mentoring
- Assessment practices & results
- Retention/graduation rates
- Student satisfaction & other outcomes
- External constituency feedback
- Placement, licensure, alumni achievement
- Faculty credentials, performance
- Research, grants, awards
- Adequacy of resources

Typical Academic Program Data: Financial Sustainability

- Application & enrollment trends
- Market demands & trends
- Expenditures per FTE student
- Credit units generated
- Avg credit units per FTE faculty
- Cost per student credit unit
- Class size, lower/upper, % < 30
- Student/faculty ratio
- Mix of faculty rank/PT/FT
- Labor as % total dept costs
- Program net revenue: costs
- Facilities, IT

Other $ measures your institution values?
Typical Data:
Student Services Quality, Effectiveness, Sustainability

- Mission, strategic plan
- Curricula
- Policies, procedures
- Student/staff handbooks
- Student usage data
- Outcomes measures, methods
- Annual reports
- Service/business outcomes data
- External constituency feedback
- Professional staff resumes
- Contributions to academic enterprise
- Cost/revenue data
- Contributions to professions
- Adequacy of resources

Good Practice

Identify the KEY EVIDENCE & QUESTIONS for programs/units to address
Student Learning Results and Assessment Processes

- **Data:** Five years of departmental assessment data and reports (direct & indirect evidence of student learning) for program learning outcomes (PLOs), institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), and WASC core competencies; other evidence of student learning

- **Questions for Analysis:** What significant trends are indicated in your student learning results? In what areas do you need to improve students’ learning?

---

**Evidence and Questions - Example**

**Q’s**

*Curriculum:* What are the curricular requirements of the program and how current are they? Does the curriculum offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for the program’s degree? How well is it aligned with learning outcomes? Are the courses sequenced and reliably available in sequence? Where appropriate, have external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, reviewed the program? Programs are expected to conduct comparative analyses. In some cases, disciplinary ratings may be available.

**Data**

Data for this section should include a comparative analysis of *curricula* from at least two benchmark and aspirational programs; curricular maps or flow charts to show how curriculum addresses outcomes; course enrollments for the last five years noting any trends; and a description of other relevant learning experiences (e.g., internships, research experiences, study abroad or other international experiences, community-service learning, etc.), as well as how many students participate in those experiences. The data presented in this section should be consistent with the program website information and the curricular catalog listings.
Examples - Evidence & Questions for Analysis

Student Satisfaction

Data: To assist you with the questions below, use (but not limited to) evidence from Appendix J: Student Satisfaction Survey Results.

a. Based on student satisfaction survey results and any other evidence you have (e.g., focus groups with students), how satisfied are students with your program’s curriculum, faculty program administration, general learning environment, campus facilities and student services? How proud are they of your program and JFKU?

b. From the above answers, what did you learn? What changes do you want to make to improve your program’s student satisfaction?

Retention and Student Success Analysis

Data provided: Enrollment, GPA trend analysis, disaggregated retention & grad rates, time to degree.

Summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program’s recruitment & retention efforts as it relates to enrolling and graduating students who fit the mission of the program. Identify any areas in need of improvement for producing successful students. In the analysis, address the following elements:

a. What does the evidence from above data exhibits suggest regarding how well your program is producing successful students?

b. List specific events/activities that the program uses to increase student retention and degree completion.

c. Provide your best practices for tracking students who leave the program (without completing) and any follow up you may do to determine why they have left.

d. Identify any areas in need of improvement for producing successful students.

Good Practice

Focus on FUTURE PLANNING:

What you need to do to improve
EXTERNAL REVIEW
Focus Reviewers on What Matters to You

It’s a Fan!

It’s a Spear!

It’s a Wall!

It’s a Rope!

It’s a Snake!

It’s a Tree!
What matters
to your
program
department
institution?

Aligning
Specialized
Accreditation
and
Institutional
Program
Review
Speciﬁc instructions for accredited programs

**Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Room for Improvement</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment with university mission and strategic plan</strong></td>
<td>Program has no mission, or mission is not all aligned with the university mission and strategic plan</td>
<td>Program mission is somewhat aligned with the university mission and strategic plan</td>
<td>Program mission is well aligned with the university mission and strategic plan; many of the goals and objectives of the strategic plan are manifest in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program quality, distinctiveness, and recognition</strong></td>
<td>Program lacks examples of recognition for quality; is not uniquely distinctive</td>
<td>Program has some examples of recognition for quality, and has distinct elements</td>
<td>Program has many examples of recognition for quality and is clearly unique and distinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning outcomes and assessment</strong></td>
<td>Program has not articulated clear program learning outcomes</td>
<td>Program has learning outcomes but has not yet defined assessment, or has not acquired assessment data</td>
<td>Program has learning outcomes, a plan for assessment, has gathered data, and has used the data to improve the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program relevance (curricular updates, graduate placement, employment prospects)</strong></td>
<td>Program has not been updated in past 5 years; does not have data or failed to place graduates; and is not aligned with employment projections</td>
<td>Program has had some curricular updates; has some data on graduate placement; and has some alignment with employment projections</td>
<td>Program has many innovative curricular updates, data showing excellent graduate placement, and is well aligned with employment projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty excellence (teaching and research)</strong></td>
<td>Program has no evidence or examples of faculty excellence</td>
<td>Program has some evidence, examples of faculty excellence</td>
<td>Program has many examples of faculty excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity for growth and enhancement</strong></td>
<td>Program is unable to justify need for growth or enhancement</td>
<td>Program has some reasons justifying need or opportunity to grow program</td>
<td>Program has ample reasons why program should have resources to grow or enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program enrollment and graduation (Note: all programs saw increase in graduation in 11-12)</strong></td>
<td>Enrollment and graduation are trending downward</td>
<td>Enrollment and graduation are stable</td>
<td>Enrollment and graduation are trending upward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OHSU**

Office of Academic Programs, Policy & Accreditation


7/19/2015

---

**Wright State University**

Program Assessment Rubric

Website: https://www.wright.edu/academic-affairs/academic-program-review/program-review-instructions-timeframe-and-template
Action Plan = PR Results

- Responsive to recommendations
- Concrete actions
- Persons responsible
- Timeline
- Resources procurement
- Tracking progress and impact
### ACTION PLAN

**Virginia Tech**

*Invent the Future*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Specific area where improvement is needed</th>
<th>2. Evidence to support the recommended change(s)</th>
<th>3. Person(s) responsible for implementing the change(s)</th>
<th>4. Timeline for implementing the change(s)</th>
<th>5. Resources needed to implement the change(s)</th>
<th>6. Plan to assess change(s) after implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**ACTION PLAN**

California State University Fresno

[http://fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/](http://fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/)
Loma Linda University

Resources for Program Review

Sample Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>Vision (Goals)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Admission and Student Services
   - Professional recruitment and enrollment efforts to increase the number of applicants by 10% annually from 2015 to 2017.
   - Review of program outcomes and effectiveness.
   - Goal: Increase enrollment by 5% by 2017.
   - Level of Achievement: 1, 2, 3, 4

2. Faculty and Staff
   - Recruitment and retention strategies to attract and retain qualified faculty.
   - Professional development opportunities for faculty.
   - Goal: Retain 80% of faculty members.
   - Level of Achievement: 1, 2

3. Curriculum
   - Revision of course offerings to align with current professional standards.
   - Implementation of a new minor in health informatics.
   - Level of Achievement: 1, 2, 3, 4

4. Student Services
   - Development of a comprehensive support system for students.
   - Access to mental health services.
   - Goal: Increase student satisfaction by 15% by 2017.
   - Level of Achievement: 1, 2, 3, 4

5. Assessment
   - Regular assessment of student learning outcomes.
   - Program Accreditation Report (PACER) submission.
   - Goal: Submit PACER report by 2016.
   - Level of Achievement: 1, 2, 3, 4


---

5-Year Action Plan

Program Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation from External Reviewer (revised)</th>
<th>Optional Recommendation from other source (include supporting evidence)</th>
<th>Proposed Actions/Responses (include rationale, if needed)</th>
<th>Responsible Person/Start and Completion Dates</th>
<th>Measurements of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approvers:
- Program/Department Chair: ______________________ Date: __________
- Dean: ______________________ Date: __________
- Provost: ______________________ Date: __________

After obtaining Chair and Dean signatures, forward this Action Plan to 1rene maillot@ pacificu.edu, the Office for Strategy and Educational Effectiveness, the Office of the President, and the Program Review Committee. You will be asked to submit a brief progress report in three years and again in your self-study in the next program review cycle.
Program-Level USE of Results

- Refine service/learning outcomes
- Redesign courses/procedures to align better with outcomes
- Re-sequence courses for better scaffolding
- Refocus curricula to reflect changes in discipline
- Cut redundant classes or low-impact services
- Coordinate assignments between GE & major
- Integrate student support services into key courses
Program-Level (cont’d)

• Strengthen or streamline assessment practices
• Create digital learning community for students
• Reassign faculty/staff
• Design professional development program to improve customer service, online teaching, assessment
• Develop applied learning initiative with employers, community, clinicians, career center
• Strengthen undergraduate research

USE of Results Beyond the Program

• Identify and respond to trends across programs
  ▪ Classroom technology updates
  ▪ Writing, research or info literacy across the curriculum
  ▪ Clear flow-charts & paths to completion for degrees
  ▪ Co-location of student services
  ▪ Addition of professional advisors
  ▪ Software for easily tracking assessment results
  ▪ Laboratory upgrades
  ▪ Improvements in IT services for students

• Measure progress on strategic plan initiatives
Beyond the Program  (cont’d)

• Enhance intra-institutional synergies to promote student success:
  ▪ Collaborate with student affairs & general education to improve student retention and performance
  ▪ Implement early-warning system for retention
  ▪ Create university-wide first-year program
  ▪ Integration of co-curricular and GE program
  ▪ Reallocate resources to academic support services
  ▪ Utilize expertise across disciplines to expand high-impact practices

• Communicate institutional good practices and outcomes
PART II: EMERGENT

Shifting Purpose of Program Review

Moving beyond just individual PROGRAM improvement.

New need:
align programs with strategic/institutional priorities
## Emerging Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical PR</th>
<th>New Needs for PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive self-examination</td>
<td>Focused on strategic/critical needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelming data charts</td>
<td>Accessible, visualized, contextualized data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 year process every 5-10 years</td>
<td>Faster, less time-consuming process and more frequent analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on inputs, processes</td>
<td>Focus on outputs/outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data about individual program, sometimes in relation to external programs in discipline</td>
<td>Data about individual program in relation to others inside (and outside) the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program improvements</td>
<td>Also institutional improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for additional program resources</td>
<td>Planning for reallocations, synergies, institutional needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Results” not widely known and sit on the shelf</td>
<td>Can’t afford to have results sit on the shelf: action plans transparent with concerted follow-up; aggregated for unit/institutional planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 Emerging Strategies for Adaptation

1. Review in strategic groupings
2. Integrate accessible data
3. Embed institutional priorities/goals
4. Aggregate results and make trends visible
5. Connect results to planning and budgeting
1. STRATEGIC GROUPINGS

- Related Programs
- Institution-Wide Portfolio

Identifying Strategic Opportunities
Reviewing Related Programs Together

**RUTGERS**

The Typical Approach Determined by the Calendar
- 2012: Nutrition, History, American Studies, Media Studies, Physics, Math
- 2013: Japanese, Russian, Mechanical Engineering, Classics, English, Accounting
- 2014: Marine Sciences, Landscape Architecture, Nursing, Urban Development, Visual Arts, Chinese
- 2015: Education, Philosophy, Biochemistry, Systems Engineering, Urban Planning, Geography

The Strategic Approach Cluster Related Programs
- Nutrition Science Cluster
  - Nutrition
  - Dietetics
  - Human Development
  - Education
  - Biochemistry

The Benefits Identify Joint Opportunities
- Hire joint faculty
- Share equipment
- Share lab space
- Launch new interdisciplinary programs
- Consolidate programs
- Differentiate programs
Portfolio Review

- Response to higher ed challenges
- Aggregate internal review
- Academic and/or administrative
- Comparative
- Common data and criteria - not comprehensive
- Aligned with institutional strategies
- Evaluated by internal review team

- **Used for holistic planning:**
  - Strengths/weaknesses in portfolio
  - Shape overall portfolio “mix”
  - Identify x-divisional themes (e.g., grad rates, selectivity, remediation, research/teaching clusters, grants, facilities, customer service)

---

**Academic Program Rubric Criteria**

- Criterion 1: History, Adaptation, and Relevance to Institutional Mission and Vision
- Criterion 2: External Demand for the Program
- Criterion 3: Internal Demand for the Program
- Criterion 4: Quality of Program Inputs and Processes
- Criterion 5: Quality of Program Outcomes
- Criterion 6: Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program
- Criterion 7: Revenue, Costs, Other Direct Expenses, and Net Surplus Generated*
- Criterion 8: Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program*
- Criterion 9: Opportunity Analysis of the Program
Program Prioritization – NOT Review
Dickeson (2010)

- Focused on ranking programs – not improvement
- Review and rankings by internal constituents
- Common data sets and criteria for review
- Audit and evaluation of entire portfolio
- Permits strategic reallocation to mission-critical and high-performing areas in effort to strengthen the institution
- Requires strong leadership, positive thinking, courage, careful planning, transparent processes, intentional collaboration and widespread buy-in
- Can accelerate distrust or create trauma in the organization

Program Prioritization

- University of Colorado System
- North Carolina State
- University of Arizona
- Lewis and Clark
- Appalachian State
- Boise State
- University of Central Michigan
- Western Carolina University
- Idaho State
- Cleveland State
- Drake University
- Howard University
- Indiana State University
- University of Minnesota-Duluth
- Humboldt State University
- University of Central Oklahoma
- East Carolina State
- University of Guelph
- Vancouver Island University
- University of Regina
- Washington State
- Tennessee State
- Kansas State
- University of Nebraska
- Southern Connecticut State University
- University of West Florida
- Cal State Polytechnic University – Pomona
- University of Alaska
- Florida A & M
ACCESSIBLE DATA

- Visualization
- Analytics

Typical PR Data

Typical ‘descriptive-report’ data included:
- Capacity Data (Headcounts, SSH, Course Enrollments, Faculty Counts)
- Output Data (Degrees Awarded)
- Student Success Data (Program Time-to-Degree, Retention/Graduation Rates, Gainful Employment)
- Financials (Budget, Costs)

Less commonly used analytics:
- Direct, objective data on student learning.
- Predictive models combining student demographic and learning data to record progress and predict future outcomes.
- Learning analytics studies

Visual Data Briefs

- Descriptive ‘baseline’ data
- Quality and KPI outcomes using benchmarking visuals
- Targeted data analysis on challenges identified by program
- Regression analysis of factors involved in student completion


PR - Interactive Data Visualization

http://oia.unm.edu/facts-and-figures/apr%20data.html
PR - Interactive Data Visualization

http://oia.unm.edu/facts-and-figures/apr%20data.html

Aggregate Interactive Data Visualization

http://irp.dpb.cornell.edu/gallery
Aggregate Interactive Data Visualization

Data Analytics

Learning Analytics: Predictors and Indicators

- Activity & Performance Indicators in Class (from LMS)
  - Number and frequency of LMS logins
  - Amount of time spend on course website
  - Number of discussion posts
  - Responses to class polls
  - Grades and formative quiz scores
  - Percentage of points earned in course to date
  - Change between past and current test/quiz scores
- Student Artifacts (from LMS or hard-copy in-class assignments)
  - Blogs, discussion forum posts,
  - Essays, written assignments
- Student Learning Outcomes
  - Measurements of student achievements in core competencies in class.


Learning/Academic Analytics

Explanatory and predictive models that can help programs determine

- Kinds of actions to \( \uparrow \) grad rate by 2%
- In which low-success courses we might \( \uparrow \) learning engagement activities (or tutoring) to improve students’ successful completion
- Kinds of data that would be useful to collect to understand more about our students’ learning
- Ways we could expand faculty use of the LMS to gain a deeper understanding of student learning
INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES

• Embed in PR process

Inherent Tension

Program Assessment and Evaluation

Institutional Planning and Goals
3. Embed Institutional Priorities/Goals

- Program Review
- Self-Study
- External Review
- Action Plan
- Learning Results
- Unit Data in Relation to Other Programs
- Institutional Goals & Priorities

Diablo Valley College

https://web.dvc.edu/wepr/documents/PR_Rubric_AS_Adopted_8_9_16_as_accepted_by_FS_and_CC_10-5-2016.pdf
AGGREGATE ANALYSIS

- Aggregate Results
- Analyze Trends
- Disseminate to Stakeholders
Use of Results

Action Plans

Aggregate Trends

Institutional Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commendations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Resource Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Impact Practices (45%)</td>
<td>Curriculum Improvements (91%)</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Collegiality (35%)</td>
<td>Assessment (64%)</td>
<td>Faculty Support (for Service, Curriculum Innovation, etc.) (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholarly Productivity (36%)</td>
<td>Advising (64%)</td>
<td>Space Addition &amp; Renovation (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Addition &amp; Renovation (35%)</td>
<td>Faculty Development (45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPLEMENTED AND PLANNED CHANGES
2014-2015 RESULTS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Changes to Academic Process

- Revise Admission Criteria (n = 4) 3%
- Revise Advising Standards or Process (n = 12) 8%
- Make Technology Related Improvements (n = 16) 11%
- Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings (n = 19) 13%
- Implement Additional Training (n = 20) 14%
- Make Personnel Related Changes (n = 31) 21%
- Other implemented or planned change (n = 45) 31%


IMPLEMENTED AND PLANNED CHANGES
2014-2015 RESULTS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Changes to Curriculum

- Delete Course (n = 2) 2%
- Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites (n = 6) 6%
- Revise Course Sequence (n = 8) 8%
- Add Course (n = 27) 26%
- Revise Course Content (n = 29) 28%
- Other implemented or planned change (n = 33) 31%

CONNECT RESULTS

- Integrate into University Planning and Budgeting
Follow-Up Planning and Budgeting

Integration with Planning and Budgeting

http://www.chapman.edu/students/graduate-students/_files/program-review-rubric.pdf
### Good Practice

Embed institutional strategic priorities into multiple dimensions of the program review process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Global Scholarly Engagement</th>
<th>Program shows no commitment to internationalization</th>
<th>Program exhibits a commitment to internationalization</th>
<th>Program shows a strong commitment to internationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Excellence in Teaching</td>
<td>Program exhibits no commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
<td>Program exhibits a strong commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Excellence in Scholarship</td>
<td>Program exhibits no commitment to promoting excellence in scholarship</td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to promoting excellence in scholarship</td>
<td>Program exhibits a strong commitment to promoting excellence in scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Following the recommendations made by the department/school and external reviewers will bring national recognition to Chapman University.

Comments:

V. The University resources required to implement the recommendations are reasonable.

Comments:
Integrating WASC Requirements

• Meaning, quality and integrity of degree (2.2)
• Demonstrate learning, including core competencies, effectiveness of co-curricular programs (2.2a,b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.11)
• Quality Assurance (2.7, 4.1, )
• Multiple constituencies engaged in improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, evaluation (4.3, 4.6)
• Responsibility for evaluating effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and using results for improvement of student learning and success (4.4)
• Appropriate stakeholders regularly involved in assessment and alignment of programs (4.5)
• Planning for a changing higher education environment (4.7)
External Review Summary Sheet* for Program Review

Degree/Major: __________________________  Date of Review: __________________________
Reviewer: __________________________  Institution: __________________________
Reviewer: __________________________  Institution: __________________________

Instructions: Please complete this summary sheet at the end of your site visit and email it to Joe Slowensky, slowensky@chapman.edu, prior to departing Chapman University. This will assist you with identifying key areas (strengths and improvements needed) to address in your final report.

Please rate the following program review criteria using the following:

E = Exemplary  S=Satisfactory  N=Needs Improvement  U=Unclear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>Evaluation (E,S,N,U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The program’s self study honestly reflects the program’s strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The program makes use of assessment results, institutional research data, and other data or evidence obtained from student/alumni/employer surveys as the basis for its proposed improvements and goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Self study identifies goals and proposes changes which are appropriate to the latest developments in the discipline and responsive to the program’s most important needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Has the program made significant progress towards achieving national recognition during the period under review? Do you agree with their strategies for increasing national recognition? Within existing resources, are there other ways in which this program could achieve national recognition?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from John F. Kennedy University Program Review Templates & Tools
Chapman University’s strategic plan has identified the themes listed below. How are these reflected in the program’s curriculum and briefly list evidence you’ve seen.

- Internationalization
- Faculty/Student Research
- Interdisciplinarity

Are there opportunities to support these themes which the program appears to be missing? Please suggest:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND CURRICULUM</th>
<th>Evaluation (E,S,N,U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs) reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the discipline/profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The criteria and standards of achievement for the PLOs adequately match disciplinary/professional standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 The curriculum content is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program and reflective of current debates, trends, technologies, and latest important developments in the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Curriculum Map: The design of the curriculum supports student achievement of the program learning outcomes, offering the required depth and breadth of study, flow and sequencing of courses with coherence, and ample culminating opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of PLOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Course Syllabi: Outline course learning outcomes that are appropriate to the level of the course and degree awarded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 The standards of evidence or indicators the program uses to compare its performance to its competitors or other like programs are valid and indicative of high professional standards.

2.7 Based on your review of student work samples, the educational effectiveness evaluation plan, and annual learning outcomes assessment reports; the program regularly and effectively uses assessment findings to improve student learning.

2.8 Do you recommend any changes to enhance student achievement or program assessment of the PLOs? If so, please explain and advise.

2.9 Do you recommend any changes to enhance the curriculum (content, currency, design, relevance, course availability, etc.)? If so, please explain and advise.

3. STUDENTS AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

| 3.1 | Students are satisfied with the overall quality of their learning experience and feel adequately supported through the curriculum to graduation. |
| 3.2 | Students are aware of program requirements and PLOs. |
| 3.3 | Retention and graduation rates are consistent with disciplinary standards. The program proposes effective strategies to improve in these areas as appropriate. |
| 3.4 | Class size levels ensure productive learning. |
| 3.5 | The program provides adequate opportunities for internships, practica, professional development, and/or field experiences, as appropriate. |
| 3.6 | Students feel that support services, staff and administration are adequate and supportive. |
| 3.7 | Admission Trends: number of inquiries, applications, deposits, and enrollment indicate program health and increasing student selectivity. |
| 3.8 | Students receive the kind of advising they need from faculty to improve their chance for success. |
| 3.9 | Students are provided with sufficient experiences with the equipment and technologies |
3.10 Do you recommend any changes to improve student experiences and the learning environment? If so, please explain and advise.

### 4. FACULTY: FULLTIME AND ADJUNCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation (E,S,N,U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Faculty competencies/credentials are appropriate for the discipline and degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Faculty specialties correspond to program needs and to the concentrations in which they teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The system for evaluating teaching practices facilitates continuous improvement of teaching and learning throughout the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Fulltime faculty are adequately supported and engaged in ongoing professional development necessary for staying current in their field and continuously updating their courses/curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Tenure and Promotion: Guidelines are updated regularly and establish a high standard for tenure and promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Do you recommend faculty changes (qualifications, expertise, teaching practices, professional development, etc.) to enhance program quality and student learning? If so, please explain and advise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation (E,S,N,U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The administrative staff and student support resources are adequate in meeting student and faculty needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Overall organizational structure and program administration is well organized, efficient and effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Do you recommend any changes to strengthen the program’s current structure, administration, staff, student support services, and resources (including possible reallocation)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Review

The purpose of an external review is to provide an outside perspective that provides a constructive, expert analysis of program quality and recommendations for future planning and improvements.

The external review takes place after the Self-study Report is completed and submitted to the Dean. However, because of the potential difficulty of scheduling the site visit with short notice, selection and invitation of the external reviewers should be done very early, well before completion of the self-study. Two or more external disciplinary experts will review the Self-study Report and accompanying evidence and then visit the campus to meet with faculty members, students, alumni, and senior administrators. Online programs that are WSCUC-only will give the external review team the option of conducting an on-site visit.

The External Review Team will submit its completed evaluation report to the Self-study Committee Chair within one month of the site visit, and the Chair will forward an electronic copy to the Office of Educational Effectiveness (assessment@llu.edu) shortly after for review by the Program Review Committee leadership.

Selection of External Reviewers

During the first month of the program review, the program will submit a list of candidates and their current CVs to the Dean. It is the responsibility of the Dean to contact potential site reviewers and to determine if they are willing and able to serve. The Dean will review the qualifications of potential candidates to ensure they meet the eligibility criteria and approve nominees for the External Review Team.

By the end of the second month, the Dean should confirm the site visit dates with the reviewers and issue a formal letter of invitation to members of the External Review Team.

Eligibility Criteria for External Reviewers

When submitting recommendations for external reviewers, please take into account the following:

Expertise

Candidates must have appropriate terminal degrees with sufficient years of experience in university teaching, administration or other relevant professional activity. Their experience is appropriate when, where, and at a level commensurate with the program under review. They are recognized as experts in their field.

Program Review Experience

Candidates will have experience with program review, student learning assessment, institutional effectiveness, external review or accreditation, and overall good fit for your program.
Conflicts of Interest
Candidates are ineligible if they were employed or worked under contract for the program under review within the past five years. Disclose all relationships between the proposed external reviewer and your Dean, Department Chair, Program Directors, and faculty or staff members.

Reviewer Expenses
The Dean and Program Director should be prepared to reimburse expenses. Each person is to receive an honorarium and reimbursement for accommodations, local travel and other appropriate expenses incurred by the site visit.

External Reviewers’ Participation
Following is an outline of the external reviewers’ responsibilities before, during, and after the site visit.

- Review the Self-study Report and other program materials prior to the site visit. The report and other materials will be provided by the program one month before the date of the site visit.
- Participate in a pre-visit conference call with the program prior to the site visit to identify key issues or concerns related to the self-study and site visit.
- During the site visit, conduct interviews with faculty members, students, alumni, and senior administrators
- Complete an External Review Report within one month of the site visit.

The Site Visit
The program’s students, alumni, faculty members (adjunct and essential), Self-study Committee, Dean, Academic Dean, Department Chair, Program Director, Director of the Office of Educational Effectiveness, and Provost will actively participate in discussions about the program with the external reviewers.

As the host, the program, in consultation with the Program Review Committee, is responsible for:

- Scheduling rooms for all external reviewer meetings with students, alumni, faculty, and staff.
- Sending the final Site Visit Schedule to the Office of Educational Effectiveness (assessment@llu.edu) no later than two weeks prior to the visit.
- Informing the program’s students, faculty and staff members about the site visit and preparing them to participate in group discussions with the external reviewers.
- Designating a private, secure office and workspace for the external reviewers to use during their stay. This includes the provision of office supplies and additional documentary evidence requested by the reviewers.
• Assigning a person to escort the external reviewers between venues during the site visit.

• Scheduling at least one-half hour for individual faculty members or groups of faculty members to meet privately with representatives of the review team.

• Providing morning and lunch hospitality.

• Optional – providing afternoon and evening hospitality.

External Reviewers’ Report

This report focuses on insights from the Self-study Report and the site visit, and provides recommendations from the perspective of experts in the program’s discipline.

The External Review Team sends its External Review Report to the Self-study Committee Chair. The Chair shares it with the Dean, Academic Dean, Department Chair, Program Director, and Self-study Committee, and sends an electronic copy to the Office of Educational Effectiveness (assessment@llu.edu) for review and reference by the Program Review Committee Co-chairs. The Dean will send a thank you letter to each member of the External Review Team.
Guidelines for Program Review Site Visit and External Review Report

The goal of program review at Loma Linda University is to promote a culture of analysis and evidenced-based program improvement. The process begins with the program undertaking a thorough self-evaluation. Significant findings from that examination are summarized in the Self-study Report. Subsequently, a team of external reviewers are invited to evaluate it from a broader perspective. Our expectation is that you will use information provided in the Self-study Report and gathered from interviews with program personnel to evaluate its standing in the academic community. Your significant findings, evaluations and recommendations are summarized in an External Review Report. If you are reviewing an online program, you have the option to request an on-site visit. We greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in this quality improvement process.

Preparation for the Site Visit
Prior to the visit, you will receive from the chair of the Self-study Committee or department:

1. A packet of information regarding the logistics of the visit (confirmation letter, arrival and departure times of site review team members, name and location of your hotel, map of the area, directions to the campus, map of the campus, parking information and permits, and a travel expense report form with instructions).
2. The Self-study Report including a narrative section and supporting appendices.
3. The names and contact information of the site review team members.
4. The name of a designated team chair who will serve as the liaison between the team and Loma Linda University. By common consent of the team members, the responsibility of site review team chair may be reassigned to another individual on the team.

In preparation for the visit, you will:

1. Review the self-study documents and supporting appendices to familiarize yourself with the programs under review.
2. Review and recommend modifications to the site review schedule proposed by the chair of the Self-study Committee (responsibility for the site visit schedule should be assumed jointly by the chair of the program Self-study Committee and the chair of the site team).
3. Confirm with the chair of Self-study Committee or department your contact information (email address, preferred mailing address) and social security number to be used in arranging for reimbursements and honoraria.
4. Make travel arrangements in consultation with the chair of the Self-study Committee or department (a site visit is typically two days in length, but may be extended if deemed desirable by the program under review).
5. Maintain written records and receipts of related expenses for reimbursement (the program or department will reimburse the members of the site review team for expenses related to their visit).

Guidelines for the Site Visit

Within the time limits of the schedule, the site visit will include:

1. Sessions with the Provost and President (if possible), Dean(s) overseeing the program, Department Chair, Program Director, faculty, staff members, and students (to the extent possible, confidentiality will be observed in these discussions). Meetings with individuals should generally be at least 15 minutes, small group meetings at least 30 minutes, and larger groups at least one hour.

2. Time for faculty members, staff members, or students to meet privately and confidentially with one or more members of the site review team.

3. Breaks for informal interactions (unscheduled time, particularly toward the end of the second day will allow for unforeseen delays and/or additional meetings, as needed).

4. Opportunities for the team to examine instructional facilities, classrooms or clinical sites used by the program.

5. Reserved time for the team to confer and plan their report (as a minimum, evenings and a working lunch session on the last day of the visit).

6. Opportunities for the site review team to request additional information or data from the program or department, though the Self-study Report will be the primary information resource for the site visit.

7. Time at the conclusion of the site visit for the team to review its findings and discuss their report. (During this discussion, the site review team should agree upon format, content, and individual assignments for various components of the External Review Report.)

8. A scheduled meeting with program faculty and administrators prior to the site review team’s departure to present the preliminary assessment.

Overview of the External Review Report

In preparing the External Review Report, the site review team should:

1. Agree before leaving the campus upon its structure and the responsibilities of individual team members for the preparation of various sections.

2. Review additional information provided by individuals associated with the program within one week subsequent to the site visit.

3. Prepare the written External Review Report by addressing the following areas:
   - **Findings:** This section includes facts, evidence and observations that the team considers to be significant with respect to their subsequent evaluations and recommendations.
   - **Evaluations:** Based upon the findings, the team should make judgments about such features as the sufficiency or adequacy of physical resources (e.g.,
laboratories, classrooms, research equipment, clinical sites, etc.), of personnel resources (e.g., faculty mentors, technical staff, support personnel, etc.), the administrative structure, the number of applicants and quality of accepted students, the educational program and curriculum, the subsequent success of graduates, the adequacy of faculty and student publications and extramural funding, etc. Evaluations should recognize areas in which the program exceeds expectations as well as those that represent challenges.

- **Recommendations:** For areas of weakness, the External Review Report should recommend potential remedies or strategies for improvement. It is especially useful to indicate how strengths may be leveraged to address limitations. The goal of the recommendations will be to improve program quality, productivity and efficiency.

4. Assemble drafts of the various sections into the final version of the External Review Report (unless the team has made other arrangements, this is the responsibility of the team chair).

5. Submit the completed External Review Report as an electronic document to the Program Director within 30 days of the site visit (the site review team chair will submit the document).

**Purpose of the External Review Report**

The External Review Report conveys to the program under review and to the institution the team’s findings and recommendations about the program’s capacity to offer degrees within Loma Linda University. The report also includes observations about the effectiveness of its programs and recommendations for the future of the program.

**Team Chair Responsibility for the External Review Report**

The Chair prepares and finalizes the team report as follows.

- Compile and edit team members’ contributions into a coherent document and return the draft External Review Report to the team members for review.
- The Chair makes requested revisions that are deemed necessary for the accuracy and completeness of the report.
- The Team Chair sends the final report to the Chair of the program’s Self-Study Committee.

The External Review Report should contain:

- Title page
- Table of contents with page numbers
- One-page Executive Summary
- Body of the External Review Report (Sections I, II, and III)
- Relevant appendices
External Review Report Length and Page Format
The report should be 1½ -spaced, using 10 or 12-point font, and should include page headers and page numbers. Generally, reports are three to ten pages in length.
Body of the External Review Report

Section I. Overview and Findings
Provide background information on the mission and nature of the program, including brief history, location(s), size, levels and kinds of degrees awarded. Indicate whether the program has off-campus sites or distance education formats, and, if so, which ones were reviewed on this visit. Record observations and data provided in the Self-study Report that are the basis for subsequent evaluations and recommendations.

Section II. Evaluations
A. Program Quality
This section of the External Review Report addresses the overall quality of the program. Suggested guidelines for your comments are:

• Have goals (student learning outcomes) for student success been established?
• How are student learning outcomes reviewed?
• Are the data complete and accurate enough to make an informed analysis?
• Are benchmark data for comparable institutions available?
• To what extent has the program achieved its standards of success?
• Provide critical assessments of:
  o How the program addresses its stated mission and the mission of the University
  o The design of the curriculum: coursework, sequencing, available learning experiences
  o Faculty composition
  o Faculty productivity
  o Support for faculty development, mentoring, and coaching
  o Student satisfaction
  o Graduate achievement
  o Support for program revisions and growth

B. Program Sustainability
This section of the review connects outcomes with expected standards and with the program’s ability to move forward. Suggested guidelines for your comments are:

• What do data on student attrition and retention show for various sub-groups of students, including different demographic groups, degree levels, and majors?
• What do data show about graduation rates and time to completion?
• Are retention and graduation rates satisfactory? If not, what plans should be made to address student success?
• Has the program identified its major challenges? How? Are there processes and plans underway to address these challenges?
• Are there adequate resources for the program to continue to operate and fulfill its mission effectively? In what areas are more resources needed?

• Is there effective planning that takes into account human, physical, technological and financial and academic needs, and sets clear priorities?

• Is there an effective alignment between program resource allocations and its priorities, mission and goals?

• Has the program identified indicators of its effectiveness and the evidence that it needs to determine whether it is achieving its educational purposes and learning objectives?

Section III. Recommendations

After reviewing the data and considering the programs plans for change, provide recommendations, insights, and potential strategies as appropriate.

Sample Title Page and Table of Contents

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY
(NAME OF SCHOOL)

EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT OF
(NAME OF PROGRAM)

Date of visit

Review Team Roster
List names of members.
Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

SECTION II. EVALUATION

A. Program Quality

B. Program Sustainability

SECTION III. RECOMMENDATIONS
### Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Sections</th>
<th>Early Development</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART I - Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Process is incomplete, no evidence of meetings; self-study compiled primarily by program head or a senior faculty member; little faculty and staff input; no input from students or other stakeholders; no indication of a process for faculty to participate. Limited history of the program is provided.</td>
<td>Process is emerging, with evidence of meetings and narrow stakeholder engagement. A history of the program is complete but lacking detail.</td>
<td>Process is complete, with clear evidence of meetings; engagement of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders is broad and collaborative. A complete history of the program is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART II - Response to Previous Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>No description of previous APR or recommendations. Program did not address or implement recommendations, nor provide an explanation for not doing so.</td>
<td>Limited description of previous APR and recommendations. Program implemented some recommendations and provides explanations for not addressing all.</td>
<td>A clear description of previous APR recommendations and program level response is provided. Program effectively addressed most, if not all, recommendations or incorporated them into its current 5-year plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response and Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART III - Program Description &amp; Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Overview of program MPG’s is incomplete; little or no discussion of how the mission influences program structure and decision making and stakeholder activities. Little or no discussion of how program MPG’s are communicated to faculty, students and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Overview of program MPG’s is emerging. Indicators of mission influence on program structure, decision making and stakeholder activities. Limited articulation of MPG’s to program faculty, students or stakeholders.</td>
<td>Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program, AND are aligned with university MPGs and stated clearly and concisely. Evidence of MPG’s influencing program design, decision making and stakeholder. Clear articulation of MPG’s to program faculty, students and stakeholders; clear analysis of how relevant critical issues are reflected in this mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1 Program Mission Purpose and Goals (MPG)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2 Current issues and alignment with OHSU MPGs.</strong></td>
<td>Discussion of relevant current issues is incomplete. Incomplete description of how program MPG aligns with/contribute to OHSU mission fulfillment, goals and core themes.</td>
<td>Limited discussion of relevant current issues and impact to program. Program has established its own set of MPGs unique to the program, and has initiated preliminary analysis indicating MPGs are aligned with university MPGs.</td>
<td>Clear articulation of relevant current issues and impact to program’s mission. Program has well developed set of unique MPG’s and has analyzed how the MPG’s align with OHSU MPGs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1 Evaluation of Program</strong></td>
<td>Limited discussion of curricular modification over the past 5 years. Static curriculum unreflective of changes in the field. Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan incomplete. Did not provide Assessment Plan and/or Program Effectiveness Plan in Appendix.</td>
<td>Program has provided overview of curricular modifications and discussion of programmatic impact over the last 5 years. Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan is complete, with Assessment Plan and Program Effectiveness Plan in Self-Study Appendix.</td>
<td>Program has provided thorough overview of curricular modification, programmatic impacts and implementation over the last 5 years. Summary and analysis of Assessment Plan is complete with clear indicators for measuring program quality and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2 Stakeholder Engagement and Program Planning</strong></td>
<td>Little evidence of stakeholder engagement in assessment planning and/or course evaluations to promote program effectiveness.</td>
<td>Program-level student learning outcomes clear and measureable. Evidence of stakeholder engagement in assessment planning, and uses results from course evaluation to begin planning for increased curricular and program level outcomes.</td>
<td>Program-level student learning outcomes are clear and measureable; assessment results regularly discussed by faculty committee and stakeholders; uses evidence and course evaluations in program planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1 Faculty</strong></td>
<td>No discussion of faculty trends that affect program development and faculty diversity; no succession planning (recruitment, retention, retirement) is evident.</td>
<td>Emerging discussion of faculty trends; preliminary planning for program development, faculty diversity recruitment and retention.</td>
<td>Explicit planning for program development based on faculty diversity and recruitment/retention needs. Supporting data used in planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.2 Teaching Evaluations and Faculty Development</strong></td>
<td>Little or no discussion of how teaching evaluations are used for program improvement. Limited discussion of faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Cursory information about faculty grants</td>
<td>Moderate discussion of use of teaching evaluations for program improvement. Emerging discussion of faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Provides information related to faculty grants/awards.</td>
<td>Provides analysis of use of teaching evaluations for program improvement. Provides examples and relevant data related to faculty development opportunities/gap analysis. Reports complete information related to faculty grants/awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.1 Students</strong></td>
<td>No analysis of program enrollment and degree production in the context of program development, capacity and sustainability. No discussion of student diversity and plans to increase student diversity.</td>
<td>Curriculum appears to reflect current practice in the discipline. Uses some rudimentary analysis of trends in enrollment and degree production in the context of program quality and sustainability. Some discussion about student diversity and recruitment planning.</td>
<td>Data about student performance and developmental needs informs program improvement. Well-developed and successful plans for student diversity recruitment, retention and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.2 Student Services and Career Development</strong></td>
<td>Limited discussion of student support services; little analysis on adequacy of services. Initial discussion of program support and student career development. Incomplete information about scholarly output and student grants/awards. Cursory analysis of student feedback processes.</td>
<td>Emerging discussion of student support services; initial analysis on adequacy of services. Preliminary discussion of program support and career development for students. General information about scholarly output and student grants/awards. Preliminary analysis of student feedback processes.</td>
<td>Provides strong analysis of student support services and program goals for student career development. Provides complete information about scholarly output and student awards/grants. Thorough analysis of how student feedback is collected and utilized for program improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Five-year Academic Program Review Rubric

### E.1 Budget/Obligations

| Initial data on revenue sources and annual financial obligations related to program operations. Does not identify important contextual factors or extenuating circumstances related to resource planning. | Preliminary discussion of the adequacy of resources; emerging resource planning for or identification of potential new revenue streams for the next 5 years. Identifies needs or sets priorities, but not linked to data. Limited discussion of context and extenuating circumstances affecting resource planning. | Detailed analysis of resource adequacy for the 5-year period; uses data to identify program needs and priorities. Developed understanding of unique program circumstances affecting resource needs. Informed by comparison to peer universities. |

### E.2 Tuition and Resource Utilization

| Preliminary evaluation of tuition and comparators. Limited discussion of students on faculty grants. Little to no discussion of resources utilized for mission fulfillment. | Evaluation of tuition and comparator programs. Provides data linked to students on faculty grants. Emerging discussion of resources utilized for mission fulfillment. | Complete information and analysis related to program tuition and comparators. Complete data linked to students on faculty grants. Full analysis of resources utilized for mission fulfillment. |

### PART IV - Supplemental Information

| Other Information (Optional for Programs) | Additional information provided about the program did not contribute to the reviewers’ understanding of the program and its effectiveness. | Additional information was relevant, but did not contribute significantly to the reviewers’ evaluation of program effectiveness. | Additional information enhanced the discussion of specific actions or changes to be taken in the next 5 years. |

### PART V - Program Goals and Reflection

#### A. Program Goals

| Discussion of strengths, accomplishments and improvements needed are superficial and not likely to lead to needed improvements over the next 5 years. | Reflects spirit of continuous improvement; directions for next 5 years are reasonably developed. | Reflects spirit of continuous improvement and self-reflection; established goals and indicators for improvement. |

#### B. Program Reflection

| Provided limited narrative that addresses what was learned through the self-study. | Emerging narrative about what was learned through the process. Identified key areas for reflection and evaluation. | Strong reflection about self-study and integrated feedback into planning process. Articulates plan for future assessment of program needs and outcomes. |

### PART VI - Supporting Documentation

| Some but not all of required supporting documents were provided. Information is limited and somewhat supports the program level goals. | Required supporting documents were provided. Documentation is sufficient and provides relevant information to support program level goals. | All supporting documents were provided and complete. Documentation is well thought out and provides context for program level goals. |
Periodic program review is a critical component of Wright State University’s commitment to continuous improvement and alignment of its mission and strategic plan with its curricular and co-curricular programs. In the periodic review, programs and departments are reviewed every five years. Program review follows the adoption of the five-year Strategic Plan and provides each department with the opportunity to reflect on its programs; review its internal methods for assessment and program improvement; review trends in enrollment, graduation, and resources; and outline plans for the upcoming years.

Each department will submit the program review document, which will be reviewed in the following manner using the rubrics below.

1. Each academic program within the unit will be reviewed using the program assessment rubric.
2. The department will be reviewed using the results of the program assessment reviews and the department level data in the program review template.

The resulting analysis will be provided to the Deans, Vice Presidents, and the Provost to assist them in strategic decision making and resource allocation. The results will also be made available to the university community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Room for Improvement</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with university mission and strategic plan</td>
<td>Program has no mission, or, mission is not at all aligned with the university mission and strategic plan</td>
<td>Program mission is somewhat aligned with the university mission and strategic plan</td>
<td>Program mission is well-aligned with the university mission and strategic plan; many of the goals and the objectives of the strategic plan are manifest in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program quality, distinctiveness, and recognition</td>
<td>Program lacks examples of recognition for quality; is not uniquely distinct</td>
<td>Program has some examples of recognition for quality, and has distinct elements</td>
<td>Program has many examples of recognition for quality and is clearly unique and distinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes and assessment</td>
<td>Program has not articulated clear program learning outcomes</td>
<td>Program has learning outcomes but has not yet defined assessment or has not acquired assessment data</td>
<td>Program has learning outcomes, a plan for assessment, has gathered data, and has used the data to improve the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program relevance (curricular updates, graduate placement, employment prospects)</td>
<td>Program has not been updated in past 5 years; does not have data or failed to place graduates; and is not aligned with employment projections</td>
<td>Program has had some curricular updates; has some data on graduate placement; and has some alignment with employment projections</td>
<td>Program has many innovative curricular updates, data showing excellent graduate placement, and is well aligned with employment projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty excellence (teaching and research)</td>
<td>Program has no evidence or examples of faculty excellence</td>
<td>Program has some evidence, examples of faculty excellence</td>
<td>Program has many examples of faculty excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for growth and enhancement</td>
<td>Program is unable to justify need for growth or enhancement</td>
<td>Program has some reasons justifying need or opportunity to grow program</td>
<td>Program has ample reasons why program should have resources to grow or enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program enrollment and graduation (Note: all programs saw increase in graduation in 11-12)</td>
<td>Enrollment and graduation are trending downward</td>
<td>Enrollment and graduation are stable</td>
<td>Enrollment and graduation are trending upward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Department Assessment Rubric

### Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>May need fewer resources</th>
<th>Resources adequate</th>
<th>May need more resources to meet need or to expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty numbers</td>
<td>Faculty numbers are trending upwards</td>
<td>Faculty numbers are stable</td>
<td>Faculty numbers are decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Faculty FTE ratio</td>
<td>Ratio is decreasing; student FTEs are falling while faculty stay the same or increase</td>
<td>Ratio is stable; faculty hires are keeping pace with student FTEs</td>
<td>Ratio is increasing; faculty hires are needed to keep pace with student FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average class size</td>
<td>Class sizes are trending downwards</td>
<td>Class sizes are stable</td>
<td>Class sizes are trending upwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total student credit hours</td>
<td>Student credit hours are trending downwards</td>
<td>Student credit hours are stable</td>
<td>Student credit hours are trending upwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Room for improvement</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course completions</td>
<td>Course completions are trending downward</td>
<td>Course completions are stable</td>
<td>Course completions are trending upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrollment: majors and intending</td>
<td>Enrollment is trending downward</td>
<td>Enrollment is stable</td>
<td>Enrollment is trending upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total graduates</td>
<td>Number of graduates is trending downward</td>
<td>Number of graduates is stable</td>
<td>Number of graduates is trending upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Room for improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with University Mission and Program Goals</td>
<td>Few or none of the department’s programs are aligned with the university mission or strategic plan</td>
<td>Some of the department’s programs are aligned with the university mission or strategic plan</td>
<td>Most of the department’s programs are aligned with the university mission and strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program quality, distinctiveness, and recognition</td>
<td>Few or none of the programs in the department have provided examples of recognition for quality or uniqueness</td>
<td>Some programs in the department have provided examples of recognition for quality or uniqueness</td>
<td>Most programs in the department have provided examples of recognition for quality or uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Assessment</td>
<td>Few programs have active assessment programs to document student achievement of specified learning outcomes and use this information for continuous improvement</td>
<td>Some programs have active assessment programs to document student achievement of specified learning outcomes and use this information for continuous improvement</td>
<td>Most programs have active assessment programs to document student achievement of specified learning outcomes and use this information for continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholarship</td>
<td>Department provided no examples to demonstrate faculty excellence in scholarship in the program field</td>
<td>Department demonstrates faculty scholarship by providing examples of excellence in a few programs</td>
<td>Department demonstrates faculty scholarship by providing examples of excellence in most programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Room for improvement</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Teaching</td>
<td>Department provided no examples to demonstrate excellence in teaching, pedagogy, curricular innovation, or student success</td>
<td>Department demonstrates excellence by providing examples in one or two of the following: teaching, pedagogy, curricular innovation, or student success</td>
<td>Department demonstrates excellence by providing some examples in more than two of the following: teaching, pedagogy, curricular innovation, and student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment trends</td>
<td>Enrollment is generally decreasing</td>
<td>Enrollment is flat</td>
<td>Enrollment is generally increasing in the department but is below university and college average enrollment trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment trends (degree and credential seeking students)</td>
<td>Enrollment is generally decreasing</td>
<td>Enrollment is flat</td>
<td>Enrollment is generally increasing in the department but is below university and college average enrollment trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE to Faculty FTE</td>
<td>The student to faculty ratio does not meet the criteria for adequate</td>
<td>In top 25% of student to faculty FTE ratio in the college OR the top 50% in the university</td>
<td>In top 25% of student to faculty FTE ratio in the college AND the top 50% in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>The revenue to expense ratio does not meet the criteria for adequate</td>
<td>In top 50% of revenue to expense ratio in the college OR the top 25% in university</td>
<td>In top 25% of revenue to expense ratio in the college AND the top 50% in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Funding</td>
<td>Has no external funding or the faculty to external funding ratio does not meet the criteria for adequate</td>
<td>In top 25% of faculty to external funding ratio in the college OR the top 50% in the university</td>
<td>In top 25% of faculty to external funding ratio in the college AND the top 50% in the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for growth and</td>
<td>The department does not provide a plan for growth and improvement</td>
<td>The department provides a plan for growth or improvement</td>
<td>The department provides a plan with a specific timeline and outcomes for growth and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Name:
Degree Programs and Certificates Offered by the Department:

Rubric Scale:
- Absent: No information is provided.
- Developing: Some information is provided, but the description and/or discussion is incomplete.
- Developed: Information and/or discussion is provided on all key components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1A. Department Overview</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brief history of the department</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission, goals, and strategic priorities of the department</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alignment of the department’s goals and priorities with college and institutional goals and priorities</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summary of recommendations from previous reviews and any changes made in response</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Significant accomplishments, challenges, and major changes that have occurred in the past 5 years</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emerging trends in the discipline and how the department is responding</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1A Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1A Overall: Department/program-level data or other evidence is included and supports the report narrative</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 1B. Academic Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Brief summary of each program or certificate offered by the department
   - Information on mission, location, format, student learning outcomes, program outcomes, and information on external accreditation (if applicable) is provided

2. Description of the curriculum for each program or certificate

3. Contribution to general education and/or other service teaching areas (if applicable)

4. Successes and challenges related to student recruitment, enrollment, retention, progression to degree, and graduation rates/number of degrees conferred

Part 1B Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)

Part 1B Overall: Department/program-level data or other evidence is included and supports the report narrative

---

### Part 1C. Student Learning and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How program curricula reflect identified student learning outcomes

2. How students are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations

3. Changes/improvements made based on assessment of student learning outcomes

4. How the department is exceeding, meeting, or not meeting students’ expectations

5. How departmental services, activities, and education foster student success and career preparation

---
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6. Other initiatives undertaken to enhance the student experience | Absent | Developing | Developed

**Part 1C Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)** | Absent | Developing | Developed

**Part 1C Overall: Department/program-level data or other evidence is included and supports the report narrative** | Absent | Developing | Developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part 1D. Faculty and Staff Profile</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rating</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How success/productivity is defined and communicated to faculty members</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How faculty are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for research, creative activity, and/or scholarly work</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How faculty are exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations for teaching/pedagogical competency</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact of new hires and departures on program quality and diversity</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How the department supports professional growth of faculty members</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How faculty expertise supports the strategic direction of the department</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Results of collaborative or interdisciplinary work</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How the department engages in outreach and contributes to the university’s land-grant mission</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1D Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1D Overall: Department/program-level data or other evidence is included and supports the report narrative</strong></td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Part 1E. Inclusion and Diversity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rating</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How the department contributes to the college’s and university’s strategic plans for inclusion and diversity</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How the department’s efforts to recruit and retain underrepresented students and faculty advance the university’s commitment to inclusion and diversity</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How the department’s organizational environment acknowledges and celebrates diversity and employs inclusive practices throughout daily operations</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How the department’s infrastructure supports progress towards achieving the goals of the college’s and university’s strategic plans for inclusion and diversity</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1E Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1E Overall: Department/program-level data or other evidence is included and supports the report narrative</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2: Where does the department hope to be in five years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Vision</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department presents a vision for where it would like to be in 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vision addresses all relevant aspects, including academic programs, student learning and support, faculty and staff, research, teaching, outreach and international involvement, and diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department describes any gaps that exist between the department’s vision for the future and where it is now</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department describes the extent to which available resources reflect the department’s capacity to achieve its desired goals
- Types of resources include personnel, financial, facilities, and technology

Part 2 Overall: Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)

Part 2 Overall: Department/program-level data or other evidence is included and supports the report narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Strategy and Implementation Items</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department presents an overarching plan for continuous improvement over the next 5 years</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement plan includes 3 to 5 high-priority, actionable implementation items</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation items are detailed enough to effectively guide departmental improvement efforts</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation items are consistent with the department’s vision for the future</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation items are supported by data and trends presented in the report</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation items appear to be feasible (e.g., mixing items utilizing existing resources with items requiring additional resources may be more feasible to implement than every implementation item requiring additional resources)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Report</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of analysis/reflection (i.e., the report narrative moves beyond describing what the department has done)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department uses data/supporting evidence to inform improvement efforts</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of broad participation in the self-study process (e.g., multiple faculty members, staff members, current students, alumni, etc.)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Narrative Report (3-4 pages):**

The review team’s narrative report should include summaries of the department’s strengths, opportunities for further reflection and action, and the review team’s face-to-face conversation with the department. The review team should focus on the department’s interpretation of data presented, depth of analysis/reflection, and resulting implementation items with a focus on alignment rather than making judgments on the overall quality of the department. The primary goal of the peer review process for Academic Program Review at Virginia Tech is to support departments’ continuous improvement efforts.
Academic Program Review Rubric

by

Kay M. Sagmiller, Ph.D
Oregon State Center for Teaching and Learning
Program Review Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds (4)</th>
<th>Meets (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program mission directly aligns to university mission</td>
<td>Mission is aligned to the institutional goals; guides planning; published widely, (including institutional data system); Program has a scheduled process for reviewing mission and its alignment to the university mission</td>
<td>The mission statement is articulated and aligned to the University mission; Mission guides strategic planning; is clearly communicated and published in the institutional data system</td>
<td>Program mission is articulated, but alignment to University mission is incomplete or in process OR the mission is not integral to strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty have a central role in planning and evaluating educational programs</td>
<td>Faculty's reflective practice and data analysis feeds into the larger dialogues of program and institutional improvement</td>
<td>Faculty cooperatively collect and analyze data (including student work), to align courses, clarify academic expectations, and improve student achievement</td>
<td>Individual faculty independently collect and assess data to improve the courses they teach, but data does not feed into major or program articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program exit outcomes are clearly articulated for the development of skills and knowledge</td>
<td>Complete program outcomes are written at appropriate level of generality; outcomes are published in the institutional data system. Academic expectations are clearly and regularly communicated to students</td>
<td>Program outcomes include knowledge and skills. Outcomes are written at appropriate level of generality and are published in an institutional data system</td>
<td>Some exit learning outcomes are identified, but outcomes are unclear and/or incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Graduation proficiency levels and expectations are clearly communicated to students</td>
<td>Program proficiency levels are identified and comprehensively communicated; examples of exemplary work is available to illustrate proficiency expectations; alumni data is used to evaluate graduates’ proficiencies</td>
<td>Proficiency levels are identified for all program outcomes; rubrics communicate proficiency levels for graduation</td>
<td>Proficiency levels are identified for all program outcomes; proficiency levels are implied but not made explicit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Numerical notations reference NWCCU Accreditation Standards 2012)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds (4)</th>
<th>Meets (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summative assessments are aligned to program outcomes</td>
<td>Summative assessments are aligned to program exit outcomes; a common scoring rubric is used to assess students' proficiencies; data is entered in institutional data system; curricular modifications are data-based</td>
<td>Summative assessments are directly aligned to program exit outcomes; a common scoring rubric is used to assess student work; data is entered in institutional data system</td>
<td>Summative assessments are somewhat aligned with program exit outcomes, but alignment is assumed and/or inconsistently evaluated by supervising faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.C.2; 2.C.4; 4.A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Formative (mid-program) assessments are embedded in required courses</td>
<td>Mid-program assessments are aligned to and feed into the evaluation of institutional academic effectiveness; a common scoring rubric is used by the program to assess student work; data is entered in institutional data system</td>
<td>Mid-program data is systematically collected on student progress as part of program effectiveness review process; assessments are embedded in required courses (e.g., 300-level courses) to determine continued academic progress in identified areas</td>
<td>Mid-program data is not systematically collected or analyzed to determine students’ continued academic progress in knowledge or skill levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.C.4; 2.C.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.A.1; 4.A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Course design aligns with, and contributes to mastery of program learning outcomes</td>
<td>All courses (including electives) are organized to scaffold students’ developing knowledge and skills; assignments align to course and program outcomes; clear, exit outcomes are written at the appropriate level of generality; outcomes are published in institutional data system</td>
<td>Required courses are organized to scaffold students’ developing knowledge and skills; assignments align to course and program outcomes; clear, exit outcomes are written at the appropriate level of generality</td>
<td>Individual course outcomes are not aligned to program and/or degree exit outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.C.2; 2.C.4; 2.C.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.A.1; 4.A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Program courses incorporate general education strands</td>
<td>Cross-curricular skills and knowledge (general education outcomes) are systematically and intentionally integrated into all program courses; proficiency benchmarks are set for each strand; student performance is systematically monitored; assessment is published in institutional data system</td>
<td>Cross-curricular skills and knowledge (general education outcomes) are integrated into all required courses; proficiency benchmarks are set for each strand; student performance is systematically monitored; assessment is published in institutional data system</td>
<td>General education outcomes are present and assessed in some courses, but student performance is not systematically monitored across program coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.C.9; 2.C.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General education outcomes appear haphazardly in the major or program; general education outcomes are implied, but not assessed programatically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds (4)</td>
<td>Meets (3)</td>
<td>Developing (2)</td>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Program syllabi are well-designed and published</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.C.2; 4.A.3</td>
<td>All program syllabi share a consistent design; course outcomes are aligned to program outcomes; academic expectations are clearly communicated prior to assigning work; student supports and academic honesty codes are included</td>
<td>Syllabi clearly list program, course outcomes and catalog description; academic expectations are clear for assignments; references to student supports and academic honesty codes are included</td>
<td>Program syllabi are inconsistent in design and content; program outcomes are not included with course outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Faculty’s instructional methods are reviewed to ensure effective and varied delivery of content and skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.D.1; 4.A.2; 2.B.6</td>
<td>Clearly defined process is systematically followed for frequent, formal review of instructional effectiveness of all instructors; scheduled reviews are integrated into professional plans</td>
<td>Review of the teaching quality of program instructors is erratic, incomplete or informal</td>
<td>Review of the instructional quality of adjuncts and tenure-track faculty is haphazard or nonexistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Faculty collaborate with library personnel</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.C.6</td>
<td>Faculty and library personnel engage in formal, ongoing, collaborative inquiry; information literacy goals and proficiencies are integrated in program courses and capstone</td>
<td>Some information literacy goals and proficiencies are incorporated into course work and are occasionally taught collaboratively</td>
<td>Information literacy goals and proficiencies are left to library personnel to teach or remain unaddressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Student information is systematically collected to inform program design and quality</strong>&lt;br&gt;4.A.1; 4.A.2; 4.A.3; 4.B.2</td>
<td>Student information guides program design, implementation, and evaluation; recruitment and retention issues are woven into discussions of program quality</td>
<td>Student information is haphazardly or sporadically collected and reviewed</td>
<td>Student information is not formally collected or reviewed for the purpose of program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Program effectiveness data is used to guide policy changes</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.A.12; 4.B.1</td>
<td>Entire faculty can explain how instructional policies reflect program review data; policies are easily accessible to students, faculty and others</td>
<td>Instructional policies are published, but are not systematically reviewed and revised as part of ongoing program review</td>
<td>Instructional policies are developed independently from program review data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Program policies are regularly reviewed to ensure alignment to institutional policies and mission</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.A.12</td>
<td>Clearly defined process exists for the periodic review of instructional policies to ensure alignment with the institution; scheduled reviews are integrated into long-range planning</td>
<td>Instructional policy reviews are erratic, episodic or informal; policy discussions rarely include alignment with institutional policies and mission</td>
<td>Instructional policy reviews are strictly episodic, driven by events rather than established processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associated Terminology

Proficiency Levels – Knowledge and skills develop over time. Proficiency levels are stages in this development. From a program design point of view, we expect our program will have a direct impact on our students’ development of a specific set of knowledge and skills. As professionals, we know what our majors must know and be able to do by graduation. So, if we work backwards, what must our majors know and do by the end of their junior year…by the end of the sophomore year? These “critical junctures” are the proficiency levels in an academic program.

Rubric – A rubric is an instructional tool that clearly articulates proficiency levels associated with a task. While rubrics can be used to calculate grades, their original purpose was to clarify academic expectations for learners. In rubric design, the requirements (criteria) for an assignment are listed on the left hand side.

Scaffold – According to Vygotsky (social cognition theorist), learners have a “zone of proximal development,” a state of readiness to learn. In a sense, the “zone of proximal development is the “edge of their knowledge base.” Instructors must therefore provide more support (scaffolding) when the learners are integrating “new” knowledge. As learners “master” the new knowledge the instructor withdraws support. From a program point of view, this suggests faculty need to identify the difficult concepts in courses and intentionally plan how to scaffold the instructional support for the learners.
## 1. Link to strategic directive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>Student Success: To what degree does the request justify a strategy (through one or more of the four college goals) to increase student success?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None or unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Linked, but indirectly linked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strongly and directly linked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Student Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>Core Values: To what degree does the request address commitment to Equity, Excellence, and Student Learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>Student Success/ Achievement Gap: To what degree does this request target closure of achievement gaps for sub-populations of students across any or all five student success indicators: Access, Course Completion, Persistence, ESL/Basic Skills Completion, Degree/Certificate Completion and Transfer Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Incomplete support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solid support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>College Scale: What is the scale of the potential impact in terms of number and percentage of students in the college?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Small #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Campus-wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Program Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>Consequences: To what degree will the request affect the ability of the area/program to continue to operate and function?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program could function the same without request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Program could not function without request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Program could not function without request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>Improvement: To what degree will the request have an impact on the identified area, allowing the program to improve and/or expand?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderately improves &amp; expands program, while having an effect on some students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Program could improve in way a that effects the majority of students in the program, and may have college-level impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>How well did the program justify the cost and need of the request?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Themes: Qualitative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous themes captured: Proliferation of technology; Campus-wide policies for tech and publications; Subject specific counseling; Reassign time; New themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Long Range Planning Council
### Program Review Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year of Review:</th>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>School/College:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria for Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The mission and description of the program are consistent with Chapman’s mission and identity.</td>
<td>The mission of Chapman University is to provide personalized education of distinction that leads to inquiring, ethical and productive lives as global citizens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
<td>Chapman University will be a preeminent university engaged in distinguished liberal arts and professional programs that are interconnected, reach beyond the boundaries of the classroom and work toward developing the whole person: the intellectual, social and spiritual dimensions of life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. The program has made significant progress towards achieving national recognition during the period under review</strong></td>
<td><strong>Initial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program does not attract faculty and students from outside CA/achieved national accreditation/faculty scholarship is not nationally recognized/students do not participate in national events.</td>
<td>The program is attractive to faculty and students from outside CA/received national accreditation/faculty scholarship is nationally recognized/students participate in national events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. The program has contributed to the Strategic Plan themes of:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Initial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personalized Education</td>
<td>Program displays little or no commitment to personalized education</td>
<td>Program exhibits partial commitment to personalized education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Knowledge in Action</td>
<td>Program shows no commitment to Knowledge in Action</td>
<td>Program displays partial commitment to K in A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Scholarly Engagement</td>
<td>Excellence in Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Program shows no commitment to internationalization</td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to internationalization</td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program exhibits a strong commitment to internationalization</td>
<td>Program exhibits a strong commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Program exhibits no commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Program exhibits no commitment to promoting excellence in scholarship</td>
<td>Program exhibits a commitment to excellence in scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Following the recommendations made by the department/school and external reviewers will bring national recognition to Chapman University.</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. The University resources required to implement the recommendations are reasonable.</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What stands out for you?
Workshop learning outcomes

• Identify and describe the fundamental components of the program review process
• Explore emergent trends in academic program review
• Illustrate the uses of strategies, tools, and resources in improving academic and student affairs review processes
• Assess organizational culture and type of partnership between student and academic affairs
• Differentiate different forms of review and develop strategies for tailoring the review process to meet the standards
• Develop and apply a culturally appropriate review process
• Align program review results with strategic planning and budget process

Frameworks for Understanding the Value of Program Review

1. Learning Institution Characteristics
2. Holistic Models of Student Learning
3. Organizational Cultures in Higher Education
Learning Institution Characteristics

1. Intentionality and shared meaning
2. Alignment, collaboration and integration
3. Holistic, learner-centered focus
4. Communication and transparency
5. Development and improvement
6. Engaged leadership


Holistic Model of Student Learning*: Beyond Silos in Review Processes

*Adapted from Tosh, Werdmuller, Chen, Penny Light, & Haywood, (2006)*
Six Cultures Activity

1. What is the value of doing program review at your institution?

2. What are the most important outcomes of program review?
Types
• Academic Review of Curricular Programs
• Accrediting Agencies Review
• Student Affairs Review of co-curricular programs
• Administrative Review

Common components of Program Review

1. Self Study
2. External/Internal Review
3. Long-term Planning and Resource Allocation
Self-Studies: Types

- Curricular Self-Studies for WSCUC review
  - On site
  - Online
- Curricular Self-Studies for reviews by other external agencies
- Student Affairs Self-Studies
- Other Administrative Support Self-Studies
Curricular Self-Study Areas

- Evidence of Program Quality
- Learning in a Sustainable Environment
- Integration of Self-Study Findings in Planning Budgeting, and Institutional Review Systems
Examples of Self-Study Guidelines

- Loma Linda: [https://home.llu.edu/sites/home.llu.edu/files/docs/Program%20Review%20Guide%20-%20Jan_%2031%2C%202017.pdf](https://home.llu.edu/sites/home.llu.edu/files/docs/Program%20Review%20Guide%20-%20Jan_%2031%2C%202017.pdf)
- Azuza Pacific University: [https://www.apu.edu/slapr/programreview/](https://www.apu.edu/slapr/programreview/)
- Chapman University: [https://www.chapman.edu/academics/learning-at-chapman/program-review/self-study-template.aspx](https://www.chapman.edu/academics/learning-at-chapman/program-review/self-study-template.aspx)
- California State University Northridge: [http://www.csun.edu/assessment-and-program-review](http://www.csun.edu/assessment-and-program-review)
- University of California Merced: [http://assessment.ucmerced.edu/assessment-campus/annual-assessment/program-review](http://assessment.ucmerced.edu/assessment-campus/annual-assessment/program-review)

Self-studies in Programs with External Agency Reviews

- Self-studies demonstrate proficiency/excellence in achieving external agency standards
- Examples: CCNE (4 Stds); ABET (8 Stds); ABA (7 std grps); CACREP (6 std sec); CAAHEP (5 std grps).
- Crosswalks and supplementary table examples:
  - Loma Linda: WSCUC PLUS: [https://home.llu.edu/education/office-of-provost/educational-effectiveness/program-review](https://home.llu.edu/education/office-of-provost/educational-effectiveness/program-review)
  - Azuza Pacific: [https://www.apu.edu/live_data/files/333/program_review_handbook.pdf](https://www.apu.edu/live_data/files/333/program_review_handbook.pdf)
Example: Supplement for Programs with External Accreditors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplemental Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Plan Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan (strategies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-Curricular Self-Studies

- CAS Standards
- CAS Review Categories
- Examples of Student Affairs and Administrative Units
**CAS Standards**

1. Academic Advising Programs**
2. Adult Learner Programs and Services
3. Alcohol and Other Drug Programs**
4. Assessment Services
5. Auxiliary Services Functional Areas
6. Campus Activities Programs
7. Campus Information and Visitor Services
8. Campus Police and Security Programs
9. Campus Religious, Secular, and Spiritual Programs*
10. Career Services
11. Civic Engagement and Service-Learning Programs**
12. Clinical Health Services*
13. College Honor Society Programs**
14. College Unions
15. Collegiate Recreation Programs*
16. Commuter and Off-Campus Living Programs
17. Conference and Event Programs
18. Counseling Services
19. Dining Service Programs*
20. Disability Resources and Services**
21. Education Abroad Programs and Services**
22. Financial Aid Programs**
23. Fraternity and Sorority Advising Programs
24. Graduate and Professional Student Programs and Services
25. Health Promotion Services*
26. Housing and Residential Life Programs**
27. International Student Programs and Services
28. Internship Programs*
29. Learning Assistance Programs*
30. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Programs and Services
31. Master's Level Student Affairs Professional Preparation Programs
32. Multicultural Student Programs and Services*
33. Orientation Programs**
34. Parent and Family Programs
35. Registrar Programs and Services
36. Sexual Violence-Related Programs and Services**
37. Student Conduct Programs**
38. Student Leadership Programs
39. Student Media Programs*
40. Transfer Student Programs and Services
41. TRIO and Other Educational Opportunity Programs
42. Undergraduate Admissions Programs and Services
43. Undergraduate Research Programs*
44. Veterans and Military Programs and Services
45. Women's and Gender Programs and Services

**CAS Review Categories**

1. Mission
2. Program
3. Organization and Leadership
4. Human Resources
5. Ethics
6. Law, Policy, and Governance
7. Diversity, Equity, and Access
8. Internal and External Relations
9. Financial Resources
10. Technology
11. Facilities and Equipment
12. Assessment
Example of a Self-Study Template in Student Affairs Programs

- Mission, Values, Planning, & Outcomes Alignment
- Unit Overview
- Stakeholder Feedback
- Cost Analysis
- Benchmark
- Assessment Summary
- Program Viability
- Key Finding and Draft Unit Recommendations
- Action Plan

Example of Self-Study in Administrative Support Unit

- Evidence of program quality
- Sustainability & growth:
- Long-term plan:
  *UC Merced’s example:
  http://assessment.ucmerced.edu/administrative/policies-guidelines-and-templates
Self Studies at Your Institution:

• Identify one element of self-studies you’re doing well

AND

• Identify one element of self-studies you’d like to improve

External/Internal Review
Overview: External/Internal Reviews

• Purposes & Types
• Components
  • Selection
  • Off-Site Review
  • On-Site Review
  • Report
• Key Questions

Examples of Reviews

• Curricular External Reviews:
  • University of California, Santa Cruz: https://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/external-review/
  • University of San Francisco: https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/Attachment_06_Academic_Program_Review_Guidelines.pdf
  • Fresno State University: http://fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/

• Co-Curricular/Administrative External Reviews:
  • Ohio State: Student Life: https://studentlife.osu.edu/programreview/
  • UC, Merced: http://assessment.ucmerced.edu/administrative/policies-guidelines-and-templates
Example Excerpt: External Reviewer Report

• Evidence of Program Excellence
  • Students - To what extent are student profiles related to program and university mission?
  • Curriculum - How current are curricular requirements
  • Student Learning and Success - To what extent are students being retained and graduating in a timely fashion?
  • Faculty - To what extent do the qualifications and achievements of program faculty align with the program's mission/goals?

Example Excerpt: External Online Reviewer Report

• Program Content Review –
  • Are the program goals and outcomes aligned well with the mission and values of the institution?
  • In what ways could the program improve its assessment processes?

• Program Delivery System Review –
  • Is the course grading policy stated clearly? Is the system set up in such a way that learners have multiple opportunities to track their progress?
  • Do students receive adequate training for navigating the online environment? Do they receive adequate online support for learning in an online environment? Do students have sufficient access to faculty and to support services?
Student Affairs

• Criteria for selecting external reviewers
  • Mission and values
  • Expertise
  • Open reporting format

Planning and Resource Allocation
Long-term Planning & Resource Allocation

• Components:
  • Action plan cycle
  • Administrative Response or MOU Process
  • Annual or mid-cycle check up

• Cultural Perspectives & Tensions

• Administrative Frameworks for Resource Allocation:
  • Sustainability (maintenance, operational) Costs
  • Strategic Planning

Examples of Curricular Planning and Resource Allocation

• Santa Clara University: between deans and program directors with annual updates; dean provides provost with annual update

• Vanguard University: Assessment Committee works annually with Budget Committee on resource allocation

• University of Central Florida: University Assessment Committee reports on annual basis to leadership on key milestones, results, and changes as a result of assessment and review; reviews are linked directly to strategic planning
Example of Student Affairs Review: Planning and Resources

• Cross-unit Action Plan
• Monthly report on targeted goals
• Resource allocation
• Review summary in next self-study

Examples of Administrative Review: Planning and Resources

• Components:
  • Action plan cycle: 6-8 years
  • Annual update on targeted goals
  • Prioritization of existing resources
  • Identification and application of new resources
  • Review summary in next self-study

• Two example campuses:
  • University of Central Florida: https://oeas.ucf.edu/doc/adm_assess_handbook.pdf
  • University of California, Merced: http://assessment.ucmerced.edu/administrative/policies-guidelines-and-templates
Benefits of Various Cultural Lenses in Resource Allocation Processes

• Collegial approaches: leads to excellence in program quality and reputation

• Developmental approaches: leads to integrated campus efforts in resource groupings/collaborations, strategic and campus planning, budgeting processes

• Managerial/Advocacy tensions: cost efficiency apparent in resource allocation and budgeting processes

How to link resource allocation with strategic planning?
Strategic Plan: Aligned Components

- **Foundation**
  - Mission Statement

- **Supporting Components**
  - Values
  - Institutional Goals
  - Vision

- **Strategic Plan**
  - Goals and Objectives
  - Implementation Plan

SCUP offers planning institutes for institutional teams: [https://www.scup.org/page/eventsandeducation/pi](https://www.scup.org/page/eventsandeducation/pi)

Example of Integrated Planning: University of Central Florida
Linking Resources to Quality Assurance

Linking Strategic Goals to Quality Assurance

• Pursuit of Academic Excellence for Human Well-being (Marquette)
• Rejecting Complacency and Embracing Excellence (U Minnesota)
• Become a National Model for Undergraduate Education (Georgia State)
• Advance Student Learning and Superior Scholarship (Pepperdine)
• Enhance Student Success (Oakland Community College, MI)
Strategic Initiatives & Implementation

**UCF Example: Increasing Student Access, Success, and Prominence**
- Develop strategies with business and employer community that increase bachelor’s and graduate degree attainment in fields aligned with current and future industry growth in the region
- Enhance or refine student support programs using evidence-based practices and information from student assessment surveys

**USD Example: Enhance Student Learning and Success**
- Fully implement the core curriculum by 2021 (includes assessment plan in implementation).
- Increase interdisciplinary learning opportunities, pilot new educational delivery systems, and expand online offerings.

---

### Similarities and Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE Assessment</th>
<th>Program Reviews</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Integrated; Highly formative and summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based decisions</td>
<td>Evidence-based decisions</td>
<td>Evidence-based decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports continuous quality improvement</td>
<td>Evaluates current status</td>
<td>Integrates current status, ongoing improvements, and future requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible budgetary impact</td>
<td>Possible budgetary impact</td>
<td>Major contributor to budgetary decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity to strengthen alignment of planning processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

115
UCF Report of Academic Program Change

Implemented and Planned Changes
2015-2016 Results for Academic Programs

Changes to Academic Process

- Revise Admission Criteria (n = 5) 4%
- Revise Advising Standards or Process (n = 8) 6%
- Make Technology Related Improvements (n = 16) 13%
- Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings (n = 21) 17%
- Implement Additional Training (n = 22) 16%
- Make Personnel Related Changes (n = 22) 16%
- Other implemented or planned change (n = 30) 24%
Workshop Summary Activity

- Review of Workshop Outcomes
- Main takeaways from today’s workshop
- Current practices this workshop reinforced
- Three new applications to try on campus
- Engaging leaders idea....
- If you could create the ideal...
One Size Does Not Fit All
Traditional and Innovative Models of Student Affairs Practice

### Evolution of Student Affairs as a Field:
- **30s - SPPV - 1937**
- **40s - SPPV - 1949**
- **50s - growth and development**
- **60s - tumultuous decade, field solidified, complexity**
- **70s-90s - adjustment and accountability**
- **90s-2000s - access and diversity, efficacy evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>Models based on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-Classroom Centered</td>
<td>• DEEP (NSSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cede responsibility</td>
<td>• site visits and consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular</td>
<td>• student affairs literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• independent practice (SA and AA)</td>
<td>• experience of authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• academic and student affairs missions may conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• infinite possibilities for student development and learning outside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organizational structures are detached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• complementary but separate missions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• work independently with some communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• learning outcomes are separate and assessed as such</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• boundaries characterize the work environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organizational structures are detached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Centered</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Silos</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• allegiance to functional area literature</td>
<td>• deliver service <em>not</em> developmentally-oriented education to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• autonomy by function, space, resources</td>
<td>• students best served when services are conveniently organized and provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• decentralized supervision and goals</td>
<td>• customer-oriented management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• competition for resources and students</td>
<td>• office reputation supersedes relationships with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Centered</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive and Adversarial</td>
<td>Seamless Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• distinctive missions and loci of learning</td>
<td>• missions contribute to total learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• student affairs activities conflict with classroom activities</td>
<td>• shared initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• segmented organizational boundaries</td>
<td>• everyone contributes to student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• in-and out-of-classroom learning is blurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• boundaries are indistinguishable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INNOVATIVE

**Student-centered**  
whole person philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethic of Care</th>
<th>Student-driven</th>
<th>Student Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • some students come to college underprepared academically or socially  
• institutions have a moral and educational obligation to provide the academic, personal, and social support students need to succeed  
• focus attention on students most in need of support | • trust in students' ability to manage college functions  
• understand the potential of the college environment to teach student leadership  
• belief in empowered students | • create a climate...  
  o where students are responsible for their education and agents for their learning process  
  o with a hands-off approach to student success  
  o with structures that empower rather than limit  
  o of shared governance |

---

**Academic Centered**  
students at center of shared learning enterprise

**Academic-Student Affairs Collaboration**

| • student affairs is a full partner in the learning enterprise  
• shared educational mission, student affairs’ mission fully complements and coincides with the institution's  
• student affairs activities emphasize intellectual growth and challenge  
• collaboration is a high priority and guiding operating principle  
• tightly coupled, structural bridges  
• working in concert rather than at cross purposes |

**Academic-driven**

| • Student Affairs...  
  o focuses on students' studies and academic goals  
  o supports the academic environment focused on academic work  
  o participates in the academic community  
  o works alongside faculty and students to develop a rich intellectual community  
  o sponsors enriched programming and recreational/relaxing opportunities |

---

### Models on an SA and AA Integration Continuum

- **Extra-curricular**
- **Co-curricular**
- **Competitive & Adversarial**
- **Seamless Learning**
- **Academic-Student Affairs Collaboration**
- **Academic-driven**

Integration between academic and student affairs
### The Six Cultures of the Academy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collegial</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Developmental</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Virtual</th>
<th>Tangible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finds Meaning In</strong></td>
<td>academic disciplines represented by the faculty</td>
<td>organization, implementation, and evaluation of work that is directed toward specified goals and purposes</td>
<td>creation of programs and activities furthering the personal and professional growth of all members of the higher education community</td>
<td>establishment of equitable and egalitarian policies and procedures for the distribution of resources and benefits in the institution</td>
<td>answering the knowledge generation and dissemination capacity of the postmodern world</td>
<td>the institution’s roots, its community, and its spiritual grounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>faculty research and scholarship; self-governance</td>
<td>fiscal responsibility and effective supervisory skills</td>
<td>personal openness and service to others as well as systematic institutional research and curricular planning</td>
<td>confrontation and fair bargaining among constituencies, primarily management and faculty or staff, who have vested interests that are inherently in opposition</td>
<td>global perspective of open, shared, responsive education systems</td>
<td>the predictability of a values-based, face-to-face education in an owned physical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holds Assumptions About</strong></td>
<td>the dominance of rationality in the institution</td>
<td>the capacity of the institution to define and measure its goals and objectives clearly</td>
<td>inherent desire of all men and women to attain their own personal maturation while helping others mature as well</td>
<td>the ultimate role of power and the frequent need for outside mediation in a viable academic institution</td>
<td>ability to make sense of the fragmentation and ambiguity that exists in the postmodern world</td>
<td>the ability of old systems and technologies being able to instill the institution’s values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The institution’s purpose is</strong></td>
<td>generation, interpretation, and dissemination of knowledge; development of specific values and qualities of character among young men and women who are future leaders of our society</td>
<td>inculcation of specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes in student so that they might become successful and responsible citizens</td>
<td>encouragement of potential for cognitive, affective, and behavioral maturation among students, faculty, administrators, and staff</td>
<td>undesirable promulgation of existing (and often repressive) social attitudes and structures or the establishment of new and more liberating social attitudes and structures</td>
<td>linking its educational resources to global and technological resources, thus broadening the global learning network</td>
<td>the honoring and reintegration of learning from a local perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

The University of San Diego’s academic program review (APR) provides a systematic and continuous means of assuring academic excellence in student learning. It is designed to encourage accountability and dialogue among members within the program under review as a self-reflective, continuous process within the broader institutional and discipline-based contexts. The process is meant to assist programs in understanding their distinctive and collaborative roles within the university community and with relevant external constituents. It provides the foundation for assessing student learning and for making evidence-based plans and decisions to foster improvements at all levels of the institution. Program reviews are integral to planning, resource allocation, and other decision-making within the university.

The four-stage process, shown in Figure 1, begins with the reflective process of department/program members completing a self-study; continues with an external peer review of the self-study and a campus visit by the external reviewers; proceeds to an internal review by the Academic Review Committee (ARC); and culminates with a long-term plan and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Figure 1. Four-Stage Process
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Stage 1: Self-Study Reflective Review

A. Self-Study Preparation:
1. Initiation of process
   - The program administrator and dean confirm with each other the date that the self-study is to commence.
   - The self-study begins one semester prior to the semester of the site visit.
   - The program administrator and program faculty appoint members of the Self-Study Team.
   - Departments in the College meet with the associate dean of the College and school programs meet with designated representatives from their academic unit to plan the review process.
2. Resources
   - The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Initiatives (IESI) provides a Program Review Guideline for the Self-Study Team.
   - The Center for Educational Excellence (CEE), in conjunction with the IESI Office, offers a Program Review Workshop for Self-Study teams to receive training in the program review process the semester prior to submission of the self-study. Teams should also schedule individual sessions with the dean’s office prior to and following the workshop.
   - The website of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) contains valuable data that should be used as evidence in responding to self-study items (e.g., enrollment, retention, graduation, faculty)
   - The Registrar’s office can provide course enrollment data.

B. Drafting and Submitting the Self-Study Report:
   - The self-study report template (Appendix I) assists programs by providing an organized format with the senate identified key characteristics, a series of questions, and suggested supporting data.
   - Excluding appendices, the self-study report should not exceed 20 pages.
   - Pending permission, programs will receive samples of other program review self-study reports and can consult with program self-study teams that have successfully completed the full program review cycle. Faculty whose programs are in various stages of the review process attend the CEE training workshop and provide mentoring roles to programs initiating the self-study phase.
   - The final self-study report is to be uploaded to the IESI SharePoint site by the Self-Study Team (see checklist for due date).

Senate Identified Key Characteristics
1. Articulation of program mission/goals, and alignment between these and the university’s and college’s/school’s mission and goals.
2. Articulation of program learning outcomes, evidence of effectiveness through outcomes assessment, and alignment with the university’s undergraduate goals and outcomes.
3. Description and analysis of data or evidence, including information about the curriculum, the learning environment, students, and faculty.
4. Articulation of the program’s promotion of scholarly work, creative productivity, curricular and instructional innovations, and linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service.
5. Identification of and comparison with benchmark/aspiration programs.
6. Description of service in support of the program’s academic mission.
7. Identification of support for student development.
8. Investment in faculty and staff.
10. Long-term plan for improvement.
Stage 2: External Review

A. External Review Team:
   1. The external review process allows for objective feedback about the program: degree and concentration offerings, curriculum and learning experiences, assessment of student learning, resources, program strengths, program areas in need of strengthening, opportunities, and plans for program sustainability.
   2. The two external reviewers are faculty members from peer institutions.
   3. A USD faculty member, external to the program under review, serves as a liaison between the program and external reviewers. The liaison situates the program within the College or school by providing a historical context during a dinner meeting on the eve of the site visit. The USD liaison does not participate in the evaluation of the program.

B. Choosing Reviewers:
   1. The external reviewers are faculty chosen by the self-study team, in consultation with the dean’s office and IESI. The program administrator submits a list of potential faculty reviewers to the IESI office (see checklist for date). The external reviewers should have a terminal degree, several years of experience, and a level of teaching appropriate to review the program. Preferably, at least one of the external reviewers should have prior program review experience, knowledge of student learning outcomes assessment, and knowledge of the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) reaccreditation process (see wascsenior.org for more information).
   2. External reviewers are ineligible if they graduated from USD, worked at USD within the past five years, were a prospective candidate at USD, are related to a USD employee, or have other conflicts of interest. External reviewers must disclose their relationships with USD employees; any current ties with program faculty should not interfere with reviewers’ ability to serve with complete candor.
   3. The USD liaison is a faculty member appointed by the dean’s office in consultation with the self-study team. The USD liaison may not be directly affiliated with the program or its faculty under review; nor can the USD liaison be a non-tenured faculty member or an Academic Review Committee member.
   4. External review candidates are selected by the end of the semester prior to the semester during which the site visit is to take place (see Checklist for date).

C. External Reviewer Documents:
   1. Once external reviewers are selected, they must sign a Letter of Agreement (Appendix IV), complete a W9 form (Appendix V), and return both forms to iesi@sandiego.edu
   2. External reviewers will be given access to a Dropbox folder containing the completed self-study and other pertinent documents prior to the site visit (see checklist for dates):
      a. The USD Academic Program Review Guidelines with Appendices
      b. Site Visit Schedule and Contact Information (Appendix II)
      c. Site Visit Logistics (Appendix III)
      d. The Letter of Agreement (Appendix IV)
      e. W9 form (Appendix V)
      f. The External Reviewer Report Guidelines (Appendix VI)
      g. Other relevant documentation requested by reviewers or supplied by the program
D. Preparation for Site Visit and Site Visit Itinerary
1. The IESI Office arranges lodging accommodations (Appendix III).
2. The external reviewers make their own travel arrangements to campus. If flying, reviewers should email flight itineraries to the IESI Office. Reviewers should keep original boarding passes to submit at the end of the visit or mail upon return home. If driving, the reviewers should indicate their mileage for mileage reimbursement.
3. The program constructs the itinerary for the site visit in consultation with the IESI Office (Appendix II). A typical site visit lasts 1 ½ to 2 days and 1-2 nights. The IESI Office will email the itinerary to the external reviewers and place a copy in the Dropbox.
4. The USD liaison meets with the external reviewers over dinner the night before the site visit begins.
5. The external reviewers should meet separately with the dean and program administrator on the first full day of the site visit. These meetings are used to welcome the external reviewers, provide an overview of the program, and answer questions.
6. At least one hour should be scheduled each day for the external reviewers to meet alone.
7. At the end of the site visit, the external reviewers provide a preliminary report at an exit meeting with the program administrator, dean, and provost.

E. External Review Report and Responses
1. The external review report should follow the format of the External Review Report Guidelines provided in Appendix VI and in the Dropbox.
2. The external review report should be uploaded to the Dropbox within 4 weeks after the site visit (see checklist for dates). The IESI Office will upload the report to SharePoint.
3. Program faculty and the dean write their responses to the external review report. Both responses should mirror the structure of the External Review Report Guidelines provided in Appendix VI (please see checklist for due dates).

F. Reimbursement and Honoraria Procedure
1. The external reviewers either drop off their airline boarding passes and original itemized receipts at the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Initiatives at the end of the visit or mail them to:

   Office of IESI
   Hughes Admin #204
   University of San Diego
   5998 Alcala Park
   San Diego, CA, 92110-2492

2. Upon receipt of the external review report, a check for the honorarium and reimbursement for travel and incidentals is mailed to the external reviewers at the addresses listed on their submitted W9 forms.
Stage 3: Internal Review

A. The Academic Review Committee (ARC) meets after the dean and program administrator have submitted their responses to the external review report (see check list for dates). The ARC reviews the self-study, external review report, and the program’s and dean’s responses. (In consultation with the program, the dean may also distribute these materials to appropriate internal governing bodies, such as faculty assessment and planning committees.)

B. When making its recommendations, the Academic Review Committee takes into account current structures in the program under review, program specific goals and learning outcomes, and the educational mission of the academic unit to which the program is assigned. ARC discussions center on identifying areas of agreement or disagreement as found in the self-study, the external reviewers’ report, the program’s response, and the dean’s response.

C. The chair of the Academic Review Committee uploads the ARC recommendations to Dropbox.

Stage 4: Long-Term Plan and MOU: The value of academic program review rests on its process, its outcomes, and its usefulness. Because the process and outcomes are developed for purposes of improving educational opportunities, curriculum quality, and program relevance, it is essential that the university make appropriate use of the results. The final stage of program review is the blueprint for evidence-based decision-making that will impact academic planning at all levels of the institution. Based on discussion at the long-term plan meeting, the program faculty, program administrator, and the dean’s office work together to finalize a long-term plan (Appendix VII).

A. The IESI office coordinates with the provost office, dean’s office, and program administrators, to schedule a long-term plan meeting after submittal of the ARC recommendations (see checklist for dates). The provost, dean, department chair, and program administrator meet to discuss the program’s long-term plan, based on the self-study, external reviewers’ report, program and dean’s responses, and the ARC recommendations. The program’s long-term plan should follow the guidelines in Appendix VII and include the following: goals for improving and sustaining the program, identification and outline of suggested strategies for responding to recommendations, prioritization of the recommendations, identification and listing of needed resources with a clear differentiation between existing and additional resources, an appropriate timeline and budget for obtaining new resources, and a timeline for completion and implementation of each item.

B. The dean and provost will issue a memorandum of understanding (MOU), acknowledging the program’s long-term plan with commitments from the dean and provost to provide identified resources to the program during the stipulated timeline. The program administrator will document all actions and provide progress updates to the dean and IESI Office as requested.

1. The MOU serves as a guide for continuous program revision and improvement.
2. The IESI Office will enter the contents of the MOU into USD’s assessment management system for follow-up.
3. After the signing of the MOU, the program will receive a standard stipend for program review to be distributed to faculty as the program deems appropriate. The program administrator notifies the IESI Office via email of program faculty members who are to receive stipends and the corresponding stipend amount.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important Dates by Cohort and Fall/Spring Site Visit</th>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort: Fall 2017</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Do a Self-Study Audit and submit to the Center for Educational Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018, Site Visit</td>
<td>Section A.1</td>
<td>Program Self-Study Team: Submit List of Potential External Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019 Site Visit</td>
<td>Section A.2</td>
<td>Program Self-Study Team: Submit Self-Study Template to ESI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018 Site Visit</td>
<td>Section B.1</td>
<td>DRAFT: Self-Study and Academic Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Introduction and Context: This section describes central features of the program. Information in this section typically include answers to the following:

A. History and Development: Provide a brief introduction and history of the program/department. Name the College or school within which the program/department resides and what year the program began. Describe degrees and concentrations. This section should especially focus on any major changes that have taken place within the program since the last review.

B. Mission and Goals: What is the program’s mission and what are its operational and strategic goals? How are these goals aligned with the mission and strategic directions of the university? If the program resides in the College or one of the schools, how does it also align with the mission of the College or school?

C. Program Contribution to University and Community: How does the program contribute to its discipline and to the university? How does the program respond to the needs of the community/region/profession?

D. Overview of Special Issues: Provide an overview of any special issues or concerns the program will address in this self-study, such as a response to a previous self-study or recognition of unique needs or concerns.

II. Evidence of Program Excellence: This section provides profiles of the central elements (students, curriculum, and faculty) and evidence of student learning effectiveness. This section identifies what the program provides or contributes to the intellectual community. The program profile is based on program planning, curricular assessment using direct and indirect evidence, and data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP).

A. Students: What is the profile of students in the program? How does the profile relate to or enhance the mission and goals of the program?

Data such as number of majors/graduate students, gender, ethnicity, average GPAs, and standardized test scores (general and discipline-specific), and retention and graduation rates are available in the program’s profile on the IRP website. Additional information about students such as membership in honors’ societies and post-graduation activities of students may be collected in exit and/or alumni surveys (contact the College or school’s dean’s office administrators for more information). For graduate programs, descriptions could include the various means used to recruit and retain students.

B. Curriculum: What are the curricular requirements of the program and how current are they? Does the curriculum offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for the program’s degree? How well is it aligned with learning outcomes? Are the courses sequenced and reliably available in sequence? Where appropriate, have external stakeholders, such as practitioners in the field, reviewed the program? Programs are expected to conduct comparative analyses. In some cases, disciplinary ratings may be available.

Data for this section should include a comparative analysis of curricula from at least two benchmark and aspirational programs; curricular maps or flow charts to show how curriculum addresses outcomes; course enrollments for the last five years noting any trends; and a description of other relevant learning experiences (e.g., internships, research experiences, study abroad or other international experiences, community-service learning, etc.), as well as how many students participate in those experiences. The data presented in this section should be consistent with the program website information and the curricular catalog listings.
C. **Student Learning and Success:** Are the students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? Are they achieving those outcomes at the expected levels of learning, and how is the expected level determined? Are they being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? Are they prepared to apply their advanced study to the world of work?

Data for this section should be available in the assessment reports of the program, including annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning (qualitative and/or quantitative); the degree to which students achieve the program’s desired outcomes and standards; ongoing efforts by the program to respond to assessment results, student retention and graduation rates (disaggregated by demographics) and student satisfaction; assessment may also include placement of graduates in graduate or professional schools and/or jobs, graduating senior surveys, employer critiques of student performance or employer satisfaction surveys, and alumni achievements. This data can be collected by exit and alumni surveys (contact the College or school’s dean’s office administrators for more information).

D. **Faculty:** What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty in the program in relation to the program’s mission and goals? How do faculty members’ backgrounds, expertise, and professional work contribute to the academic excellence of the program?

Data should include the proportion of faculty with terminal degrees, institutions from which faculty earned terminal degrees, list of faculty specialties within discipline (and how these align with the program curriculum); evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness (e.g., peer observations and evaluations, faculty self-evaluations, students’ course evaluations, faculty scholarship on teaching and learning, and participation in faculty development related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment record of scholarship; external funding awards; professional practice and service; distribution of faculty ranks; diversity; and general awards and recognition. In addition to the compilation of this information, faculty CVs should be appended. In the initial review cycle, data should be comprehensive; in subsequent reviews, the compilation should focus on faculty accomplishments in the previous 5-6 years.

III. **Program Sustainability and Support:** This section identifies student demand for the program and the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately and are sufficient in amount to maintain program quality. In the “dialogue,” this section identifies what the program needs to be sustained.

A. **Program Demand:** In terms of similarity and distinctiveness, evaluate how well this program compares with other programs in the field. What are the trends in numbers of student major declarations and enrollments reflected over a 5-8 year period? What is happening within the profession, local community, or society generally that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future?

Data in this section might emphasize how the unique elements identified in previous sections are expected to attract students to this program.
B. Allocation of Resources:

1. **Faculty:** Are there sufficient numbers of faculty to maintain program quality? Do program faculty have the support they need to do their work?

Data in this section might include the number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time-to-part-time faculty), student-faculty ratio, faculty workload, faculty review and evaluation processes, mentoring processes/programs, professional development opportunities/resources (including travel funds), release time for course development, research, etc.

2. **Student support:** Are there sufficient mechanisms in place to assist students with achieving their academic goals?

Data in this section might include academic and career advising programs and resources, tutoring and supplemental instruction, basic skills remediation, support for connecting general learning requirements to discipline requirements, orientation and transition programs, financial support, support for engagement across the community, and support for non-cognitive variables of success (including emotional, psychological, and physical interventions if necessary).

3. **Technology and Information Literacy Resources:** What technology and information literacy resources do the program currently use? Are there adequate Library and IT resources for sustaining the program?

Data in this section might include library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program, development and achievement of information literacy outcomes, technology resources available to support pedagogy and research in the program, and technology resources available to support students’ program needs.

4. **Facilities:** What facilities and unique space or equipment (e.g., labs) does the program use? Are the facilities adequate for sustaining the quality of the program?

Data in this section might include classroom space, instructional laboratories, research laboratories, office space, student study spaces, access to classrooms suited for IT purposes, and access to classrooms designed for alternative learning styles/universal design.

5. **Staff:** Clerical and technical staff supporting program operations:

Calculate data in terms of faculty/student load, FTE, etc.

6. **Financial resources:** What do the operational budget trends (revenues and expenditures) show over a 3-5 year period?

Evidence in this category might include increasing or decreasing revenues in areas directly related to sustainability issues (e.g., no increases or replacements in tenure lines with rising numbers of students, or little funding available for necessary equipment to keep students current in the practice of their fields).
IV. Reflection Summary:

The self-study concludes with a general analysis or interpretation of the evidence for program excellence and effectiveness, and support for sustainability. Provide an overview of the program’s strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

V. Goals and Planning for Improvement:

The reflection summary serves as a foundation for developing the program’s long-term plan. Several guiding questions include:

- What are the program’s primary goals for the next five-seven years?
- In order to achieve these goals, how will the program address any weaknesses and build on existing strengths?
- How will the program make improvements with existing resources (through reallocation) and with new and innovative collaborations?
- What additional resources will be needed?
- If the program is currently using an already developed and executed long-term plan, please indicate how the current plan will integrate with the existing plan.
The site visit begins with the USD liaison dinner meeting with the two external reviewers the night before the two-day campus visit. This meeting serves as an opportunity to review the itinerary. The external reviewers will meet with the dean, the dean’s office administration (associate dean, etc.), and program administration on the first day of the visit. Meetings with various faculty groups and students are scheduled throughout the visit. At least one hour per day is scheduled for the reviewers to meet alone to draft their report. During the exit meeting held at the end of the site visit, the external reviewers share their preliminary observations with the provost, dean, and program administration.

The department arranges breakfast, lunch, and dinner for the external reviewers for the duration of the visit. The program, with assistance from the dean’s office, is responsible for constructing and coordinating the basic itinerary and arranging travel to and from campus. The dean’s office and the IESI Office arrange lodging, dinner reservations with the liaison on the first night, and meetings with the dean and associate provost/provost. The reviewers make their own dinner arrangement the second night. Below is a sample schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Site Visit Itinerary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eve of Campus Site Visit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Visit Day 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Visit Day 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide the external reviewers with important contact information:

- USD liaison email/work/cell phone
- External Reviewers’ email/cell phone
- Program Chair or program review coordinator email/work/cell phone
- IESI Office; (619) 260-4816; email: iesi@sandiego.edu
- Hotel address and phone number
APPENDIX III: SITE VISIT LOGISTICS

For External Reviewers

Travel
The external reviewer should make his or her own plane reservations and request reimbursement from the IESI Office (please submit original boarding passes). The university will reimburse round-trip, coach airfare.

Lodging
The IESI Office will make hotel accommodations for external reviewers, consistent with university policy.

Reimbursement
Meals and local travel expenses associated with the visit will be reimbursed by the IESI Office upon request and with the submission of original receipts. Meal expenses should be held within the $71/day per diem rate for San Diego (or the current M&IE per diem rate as published on the US General Services’ web site www.gsa.gov/perdiem).

For Departments

Meals and Other Expenses
The IESI Office will provide a USD-One card to the USD liaison and a program faculty member responsible for external reviewers’ meals and incidental costs. All original itemized receipts and names of attendees must be submitted to IESI.

If using a personal credit card or cash, fill out the petty cash form (if under $100) or expense reimbursement form. Check requests, petty cash forms or expense reports should be sent to the IESI Office for approval. Forms are available online from the Accounting Office's web site found at: http://www.sandiego.edu/finance/accounts-payable/forms.php#accordion1. Please follow all Accounts Payable policies.

If the department chooses to use its own USD One card, please contact IESI for the POETS code.
LETTER OF AGREEMENT PERTAINING TO EXTERNAL REVIEW PARTICIPATION

Thank you for serving as an external reviewer for the University of San Diego (USD). For your participation, you receive an honorarium of one thousand dollars and reimbursement for travel to and from USD.

As an external reviewer, your responsibilities include reviewing the self-study and any additional relevant materials delivered to you 4-6 weeks prior to the 1 ½ to 2 day site visit. You will be invited to participate in a dinner meeting on the eve of the site visit.

During the site visit you will meet with faculty, students, staff, and senior administrators. Before you depart campus, you will have an exit meeting with administrators from the provost’s office, dean’s office, and program. You will have four (4) weeks from the last day of the site visit to write and submit the external review report using the External Review Report Guidelines in Appendix VI of the USD Academic Program Review Guidelines.

Every program review requires the utmost care in preserving confidentiality. You will secure all documents and refrain from discussing issues with anyone other than the other external reviewer or USD faculty and staff. We would also expect that any personal and/or professional ties you may have with the program faculty would not affect your ability to serve with complete candor.

Occasionally, you may hear allegations of misconduct (e.g., harassment, falsification, etc.) during the site visit. It is not your responsibility to handle these allegations. You should report allegations to the IESI Assistant Vice President, who will discuss them with the appropriate USD personnel.

If you agree with these terms, please sign and date this form and e-mail to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Initiatives: iesi@sandiego.edu.

Print Name/Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

IESI-AVP Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

USD Academic Program Review Revised 9/20/17
### Appendix V: External Reviewer - W9 Form

- **General Instructions**
  - Section references are to the Internal Revenue Code unless otherwise noted.
  - Future developments. Information about developments affecting Form W-9 (such as legislation enacted after we release it) is at www.irs.gov/w9.

- **Purpose of Form**
  - An individual or entity (Form W-9 requestor) who is required to file an information return with the IRS must obtain your correct taxpayer identification number (TIN) which may be your social security number (SSN), individual taxpayer identification number (ITIN), adoption taxpayer identification number (ATIN), or employer identification number (EIN), to report on an information return the amount paid to you, or other amount reportable on an information return. Examples of information returns include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - Form 1099-INT (interest earned or paid)
    - Form 1099-DIV (dividends, including those from stocks or mutual funds)
    - Form 1099-MISC (miscellaneous income, prizes, awards, or gross proceeds from activities not described elsewhere)
    - Form 1099-B (stock or mutual fund sales and certain other transactions by brokers)
    - Form 1099-S (proceeds from real estate transactions)
    - Form 1099-K (miscellaneous card and third party network transactions)

- **Part I: Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)**
  - Enter your TIN in the appropriate box. The TIN provided must match the name given on line 1 to avoid backup withholding. For individuals, this is generally your social security number (SSN). However, for a resident alien, sole proprietor, or disregarded entity, see the Part I instructions on page 3. For other entities, it is your employer identification number (EIN). If you do not have a number, see how to get a TIN on page 3.
  - Note. If the account is in more than one name, see the instructions for line 1 and the chart on page 4 for guidelines on whose number to enter.

- **Part II: Certification**
  - Under penalties of perjury, I certify that:
    1. The number shown on this form is my correct taxpayer identification number (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me); and
    2. I am not subject to backup withholding because: (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that I am subject to backup withholding as a result of a failure to report all interest or dividends, or (c) the IRS has notified me that I am no longer subject to backup withholding; and
    3. I am a U.S. citizen or other U.S. person (as defined below); and
    4. The FATCA code(s) entered on this form (if any) indicating that I am exempt from FATCA reporting is correct.

- **Certification Instructions**
  - You must cross out item 2 above if you have been notified by the IRS that you are subject to backup withholding because you have failed to report all interest and dividends on your tax return. For real estate transactions, Item 2 does not apply. For mortgage interest paid, acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, contributions to an individual retirement arrangement (IRA), and generally, payments other than interest and dividends, you are not required to sign the certification, but you must provide your correct TIN. See the instructions on page 3.

- **Sign Here**
  - Signature of U.S. person
  - Date

Directions for completing this form are included in the Dropbox with other pertinent documents.
External Review Report Guidelines
USD Academic Program Review

The external review process provides a means for gathering objective feedback about the many aspects of a program. In addition to reviewing the program's self-study, the external reviewers participate in an on-site campus visit to observe firsthand how the program operates. The reviewers will produce a report that discusses the program's strengths, areas that could benefit from attention, and opportunities for long-term improvement and sustainability. This report follows the structure of the self-study, but may include additional topics as well.

Please provide us with the following information:

Program Name

Name of Reviewers

Date
I. Introduction and Context

Use Section I of the self-study and your site visit observations to provide feedback about the following aspects of the program:

IA. History and Development: Program offerings and development.
How do the program's current status and future plans connect to or follow from its history and past development?

IB. Mission and Goals: Program's alignment of mission and goals with the university's mission and strategic directions.
To what extent has the program aligned its mission and goals with the university's mission and strategic directions?

IC. Program’s Contribution to University and Community:
To what extent is the program contributing to the University and the needs of the community?

ID. Program’s Overview of Special Issues or Concerns:
If there were any special issues or concerns, how were they presented in the self-study?

Section I. Reviewers' Comments: Introduction and Context of Program

Section I. Reviewers' Recommendations: Introduction and Context of Program
II. Evidence of Program Excellence

Use Section II of the self-study and your site visit observations to provide feedback about the following aspects of the program:

IIA. Students: *Evidence of student profiles related to program and university mission.*
To what extent are student profiles related to program and university mission?

IIB. Curriculum: *Evidence of a current curriculum and related learning experiences.*
How current are curricular requirements? Does the curriculum offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for the program’s degree? How well is the curriculum aligned with the learning outcomes? Are the courses sequenced and reliably available in sequence? What was revealed from the program's comparative analysis of similar and aspirational programs?

IIC. Student Learning and Success: *Evidence of student learning and success.*
How well are the student learning outcomes interwoven throughout the curriculum to provide opportunities for students to develop increasing sophistication? To what extent are the student learning outcomes reflective of national disciplinary standards or trends? To what extent are students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program? To what extent are students being retained and graduating in a timely fashion? To what extent are students prepared to apply their advanced study to the world of work? To what extent is a program assessment plan being used to capture student learning outcomes, assessment measures, results, and opportunities for improvement?

IID. Faculty: *Evidence of faculty contribution to the academic excellence of the program.*
To what extent do the qualifications and achievements of program faculty align with the program’s mission/goals? How do faculty members’ backgrounds, expertise, and professional work contribute to the academic excellence of the program and service to the institution and community?

Section II. Reviewers' Comments: Evidence of Program Excellence

Section II. Reviewers' Recommendations: Evidence of Program Excellence
Appendix VI: External Reviewer Report Guidelines (continued)

III. Program Sustainability and Support

Use Section III of the self-study and your site visit observations to provide feedback about the following aspects of the program:

**III.A. Program Demand:** Evidence that program offerings are determined with consideration of and in response to program demand.

In terms of similarity and distinctiveness, how does the program compare to other programs in the field? What is happening within the profession, local community, or society in general that identifies an anticipated need for the program in the future? To what extent does the program enrollment trend suggest a sustainable program?

**III.B1. Resources - Faculty:** Evidence that there is a number of faculty members and a level of support identified to maintain program quality.

To what extent can the program maintain a quality program with the current number and distribution of faculty? How does the student/faculty ratio compare to similar programs? How does the tenure-line faculty/adjunct faculty ratio compare to similar programs? To what extent do program faculty have the support they need to do their work (e.g., mentoring program, professional development opportunities, release time opportunities for course development or research, travel funds, and a well-defined review and evaluation process)?

**III.B2. Resources - Student Support:** Evidence that there are sufficient mechanisms (student support services) identified to help students achieve their academic goals.

To what extent are there mechanisms in place to assist students with achieving their academic goals (e.g., academic and career advising; tutoring or remediation; orientation; financial support; and emotional, psychological, and physical interventions)?

**III.B3. Resources - Technology and Information Literacy:** Evidence that there are adequate technology and information literacy resources identified for program sustainability.

To what extent are there technology and information literacy resources to support and sustain the program (e.g., electronic and print holdings, development and achievement of information literacy outcomes, technology to support pedagogical and research needs, and technology and information literacy resources to support student program needs)?

**III.B4. Resources - Facilities:** Evidence that there are adequate facilities identified for sustaining the quality of the program.

To what extent are the facilities and equipment adequate for sustaining a quality program?

**III.B5. Resources - Staff:** Evidence that there are a sufficient number of clerical and technical staff identified to support program operations.

To what extent does the program have clerical and technical staff to support program operations?

**III.B6. Resources - Financial Resources:** Evidence of operational budget trends that support program sustainability. To what extent do the operational budget trends (revenues and expenditures) suggest a sustainable quality program?

Section III. Reviewers' Comments: Section III. Program Sustainability and Support

Section III. Reviewers' Recommendations: Section III. Program Sustainability and Support
Appendix VI: External Reviewer Report Guidelines (continued)

IV. Reviewers' Comments
This section allows for reviewers' comments about the overall strengths of the program, areas that could benefit from attention, and program opportunities for long-term improvement and sustainability.

Section IV. Reviewers' Comments: Program Strengths

Section IV. Reviewers' Comments: Program Areas that can Benefit from Attention

Section IV. Reviewers' Comments: Program Opportunities for Long-Term Improvement and Sustainability:

Section IV. Additional Reviewers' Comments:
Appendix VII: Long-Term Plan Guidelines

Academic Program Review
Long-Term Plan Guidelines

Department/Program Name:

Date:

The long-term plan for the department/program should stem from the academic program review findings and the responses and recommendations received from the external reviewers, the Dean’s Office, program faculty, and the Academic Review Committee. Start by writing a narrative that explains the information that will be shown in the long-term summary tables that follow. Goal/Action areas can be taken directly from the self-study (e.g., students, curriculum, student learning outcomes, student success, faculty, program demand, student support, information literacy, technology, facilities, staff, financial resources, other). The table format can be copied or deleted as needed.
Additional Resources
Program Review Resources

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW – GENERAL RESOURCES:

- Education Advisory Board (2012). Revitalizing the program portfolio: Aligning program performance with institutional goals. Washington, D.C.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW – INSTITUTIONAL SAMPLES

Sample Self-Study guides and templates:

- Loma Linda University Program Review Guide https://home.llu.edu/academics/academic-resources/educational-effectiveness/program-review
- Azusa Pacific University Program Review Handbook http://www.apu.edu/slapr/programreview/
- University of the Pacific http://www.pacific.edu/About-Pacific/AdministrationOffices/Office-of-the-Provost/Educational-Effectiveness/Program-Review/Program-Review-Self-Study.html
- University of San Diego http://www.sandiego.edu/outcomes/documents/USD%20Academic%20Program%20Review%20Guidelines%20Revised%20Fall%202017.pdf


Integration of program review and specialized accreditation:

- Loma Linda University https://home.llu.edu/academics/academic-resources/educational-effectiveness/program-review (esp. pp. 33-35)
External Review resources:

- Loma Linda University External Review Guide (includes integration with specialized accreditation) [https://home.llu.edu/academics/academic-resources/educational-effectiveness/program-review](https://home.llu.edu/academics/academic-resources/educational-effectiveness/program-review) (click on Guidelines for Program Review Site Visit and External Review Report)
- University of Central Florida – scroll down to Consultant Report Templates (undergrad programs, grad programs, departments): [https://apq.ucf.edu/apr/](https://apq.ucf.edu/apr/)

Program Review rubrics for internal evaluation:

- Wright State University [https://www.wright.edu/academic-affairs/academic-program-review/program-review-instructions-timeline-and-template](https://www.wright.edu/academic-affairs/academic-program-review/program-review-instructions-timeline-and-template)
- Diablo Valley College [https://web.dvc.edu/wepr/documents/PR_Rubric_AS_Adopted_8_9_16_as_accepted_by_FS_and_CC_10-5-2016.pdf](https://web.dvc.edu/wepr/documents/PR_Rubric_AS_Adopted_8_9_16_as_accepted_by_FS_and_CC_10-5-2016.pdf)
- IUPUI [http://planning.iupui.edu/accreditation/program-review-files/academicguidelines.pdf](http://planning.iupui.edu/accreditation/program-review-files/academicguidelines.pdf) (pp. 10-11)

Sample Action Plan templates:

- CSU Fresno [https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/](https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/) (click on Action Plan template)
- Loma Linda University [https://home.llu.edu/sites/home.llu.edu/files/docs/Program%20Review%20Guide%20%20Jan%20%2031%2C%202017.pdf](https://home.llu.edu/sites/home.llu.edu/files/docs/Program%20Review%20Guide%20%20Jan%20%2031%2C%202017.pdf) (pp. 30-32)

Connecting program review to institutional budgeting, planning, priorities:

- Diablo Valley College Program Review Rubric [https://web.dvc.edu/wepr/documents/PR_Rubric_AS_Adopted_8_9_16_as_accepted_by_FS_and_CC_10-5-2016.pdf](https://web.dvc.edu/wepr/documents/PR_Rubric_AS_Adopted_8_9_16_as_accepted_by_FS_and_CC_10-5-2016.pdf)
- Chapman University Long-Range Planning Council Rubric [https://www.chapman.edu/students/graduate-students/_files/program-review-rubric.pdf](https://www.chapman.edu/students/graduate-students/_files/program-review-rubric.pdf)
STUDENT AFFAIRS & ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM REVIEW & ASSESSMENT RESOURCES – SAMPLE GUIDELINESES

- James Madison University, Student Affairs Program Review. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://www.jmu.edu/studentaffairs/program-review/index.shtml.
- University of Connecticut Division of Student Affairs- Program Review. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://studentaffairs.uconn.edu/program-review/

STUDENT AFFAIRS & ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM REVIEW & ASSESSMENT - GENERAL RESOURCES

In spring 2017, with funding from Lumina Foundation, WSCUC launched the first cohort of the Community of Practice for Advancing Learning Outcomes Visibility. This initiative provides guidance and consulting for projects related to assessing student learning and the visibility of that learning. WSCUC is supporting participants as they implement their own projects, which will contribute to the development of a collection of good practices, resources, and guides to share both regionally and nationally.

Participants in the Community of Practice are engaging in student learning assessment and visibility projects that are informed by national and regional thought leadership, knowledge generation, capacity building, and resource sharing within the Community of Practice, with the intention of broad-based engagement across the region over time. Expert consultant are guiding projects and highlighting best practices, and participants are building networks to support projects and share ideas and information.

Community of Practice outcomes include:

- **Improved Learning Outcomes Visibility**: to support WSCUC institutions in making good evidence of student learning more visible and accessible to a general public and various stakeholders.

- **Learning Outcomes Capacity Building**: to further develop WSCUC’s regional capacity and national leadership in providing evidence of student learning as one crucial component of student achievement. The key focus is on using learning outcomes assessment results to support authentic student learning and/or institutional improvement.

- **Quality Assurance / Accreditation Resource Development, Curation, and Dissemination**: to develop a curated collection of accreditation process resources, including exemplars and learning guides for the WSCUC region – and nationally – around aligning and assessing student learning outcomes per the Standards or Accreditation, the visibility of evidence, and using evidence for improvement.

Visit the Community of Practice on WSCUC’s website to learn about current projects and mentors:
www.wscuc.org/cop
An Opportunity for Your Institution to Develop Assessment Expertise and Leadership
March 2018 - January 2019
Applications will be accepted November 15, 2017 - February 15, 2018

Purpose of the Academy
The WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy (ALA) prepares postsecondary professionals to provide leadership in a wide range of activities related to the assessment of student learning, from facilitating workshops and supporting the scholarship of assessment to assisting administrative leadership in planning, budgeting, and decision-making related to educational effectiveness. ALA graduates have also provided consultation to the WSCUC region and served on WSCUC committees and evaluation teams; some have moved on to new positions with greater responsibilities. The Academy curriculum includes both structured and institutionally-tailored learning activities that address the full spectrum of assessment issues, and places those issues in the national context of higher education policy on educational quality, accreditation, and accountability.

Who Should Participate in the Academy?
Higher education faculty, staff, and administrators who are committed to:
• Developing assessment expertise;
• Serving in an on-going assessment leadership role at their institution;
• Devoting significant time to complete ALA reading and homework assignments.

Assessment Leadership Academy Faculty
ALA participants will interact with and learn from nationally-recognized higher education leaders. Faculty lead interactive class sessions and are available to participants for one-on-one consultations.

Faculty Facilitators of the ALA:
• Amy Driscoll, Former Director of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, CSU Monterey Bay
• Carole Huston, Associate Provost, University of San Diego (ALA Alum)

Guest Faculty Include:
• Peter Ewell, President Emeritus, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
• Adrianna Kezar, Associate Professor for Higher Education, University of Southern California
• Jillian Kinzie, Associate Director, Center for Postsecondary Research & NSSE Institute
• Kathleen Yancey, Kellogg W. Hunt Professor of English, Florida State University
• Laurie Dodge, Vice Chancellor of Institutional Assessment and Planning, Brandman University (ALA Alum)
• Kevin Grant, Assistant Dean of Student Development, Biola University (ALA Alum)
• Susan Platt, Executive Director of Assessment Emerita, CSU Long Beach (ALA Alum)
• And others!

Learning Goals
Participants who complete Academy requirements will acquire foundational knowledge of the history, theory, and concepts of assessment; they will also develop expertise in training and consultation, institutional leadership for assessment, and the scholarship of assessment.

Application Deadline and More Information
Applications for the 2018-19 cohort will be accepted from November 15, 2017 until February 15, 2018.

For more information and application materials, please see Assessment Leadership Academy on the WSCUC website http://www.wascsenior.org/ala/overview
Assessment shouldn’t feel like a waste of time and resources. With over 50 years of combined experience working with more than 1,000 institutions of higher education, we'll help you cultivate and grow meaningful assessment practices and harness better data for learning campus-wide.

Visit www.taskstream-tk20.com to learn what we can do for you.
WHAT IS YOUR “FUTURE PERFECT” FOR HIGHER EDUCATION?

JOIN THE CONVERSATION!

APRIL 25-27, 2018
HYATT REGENCY
BURLINGAME, CA

ARC 2018
ACADEMIC RESOURCE CONFERENCE

www.wascarc.org

Senior College and University Commission