



AZUSA PACIFIC
UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK:

Ninth Edition

**THIS DOCUMENT SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS
PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOKS**

Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
Please direct questions to Shawna L. Lafreniere, Ph.D.
Director of Curricular Effectiveness
slafreniere@apu.edu

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Principles of Program Review at APU
- 1.2 Accountability for Program Review
- 1.3 Clarifying Program Review Committees and Their Work
- 1.4 Program Review Cycle
- 1.5 Program Review and External Accrediting Agency
- 1.6 Program Review External Reviewers
- 1.7 Timely Completion of Program Review

2. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

- 2.1 PHASE ONE: Preparing for the Program Review
- 2.2 PHASE TWO: Writing the Report
- 2.3 PHASE THREE: Reviewing and Evaluating the Report
- 2.4 PHASE FOUR: Responding to the Findings of Program Review
- 2.5 PHASE FIVE: Reporting on the Progress of the Review

3. COMPONENTS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

- 3.1 Cover Sheet, Faculty/Dean Verification and Table of Contents
- 3.2 Response to the Components
 - Component A – Curriculum
 - Component B – Student Learning and Success
 - Component C – Quality of Faculty
 - Component D – Program Viability and Sustainability
 - Component E – Analysis of Program Strengths, Areas for Growth, and Action Plan
- 3.3 Additional Documentation
- 3.4 External Reviewer Report
- 3.5 Program Review Committee Report and Rubric

3.6 Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding

3.7 Mid-Cycle Status Report

Table One: The Program Review General Timeline

1. INTRODUCTION

Program Review is a vital process at Azusa Pacific University (APU) and within higher education in general, enabling APU, through its schools and colleges, and their departments, to examine the effectiveness of all its academic programs—to strengthen and maintain the university's curriculum within a faith-based context, by generating and pursuing informed recommendations related to student learning, program design, faculty effectiveness, and resource allocation aimed at achieving the university's Academic Vision 2022. It provides the opportunity for us to demonstrate our educational effectiveness to ourselves, our students, our accrediting agencies, and the various communities we serve. Consequently, program review is an essential, systematic, and periodic process in which all academic programs participate.

This handbook sets forth the procedures governing the APU academic program review process. It stipulates the common program review process for all academic programs, graduate and undergraduate. Program review and this handbook are also designed to address elements that are important to WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) accreditation standards, as well as elements unique to APU (for example, faith integration).

For purposes of APU program review, the following guidelines will be used to define and schedule program review: at the graduate level, all programs offering a degree are subject to independent program reviews; at the undergraduate level, all majors and stand-alone minors are subject to independent program reviews; undergraduate programs that share more than 50% of their curriculum with another program may request permission to conduct a joint program review. All requests for exceptions are filed with the Director of Curricular Effectiveness.

1.1. Principles of Program Review at APU

The following principles undergird the program review process and act as underlying assumptions. Many are adapted from the WASC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review (2009).

1. Academic program review is a collaborative academic process; that is, the program review process is governed by Academic Senate policy, and programs are reviewed by faculty Program Review Committees (PRCs). Additionally, departmental faculty and administrators collectively engage in inquiry and analysis of program quality. Agreed-upon recommendations are the result of deliberations between the department, the Program Review Committee, and appropriate senior administrators.

2. Program improvement is the primary outcome of the review process; thus, programs are responsible for generating specific action plans to address needed modifications and improvements, followed in subsequent reviews with an analysis of the effectiveness of those modifications. Collaborative involvement of administration in the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding process helps to secure buy-in for change and improvement, as well as to ensure alignment with institutional goals and resources.
3. Program Review typically occurs on a 7-year timeline; however, it can occur at any point in time prior to the established deadline, including aligning with accreditation visits.
4. Peer review is necessary for a successful program review. APU faculty peer-review committees are utilized to ensure consistency of quality across academic level (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral) and to encourage accountability in the action planning process. For unaccredited programs, the program review process includes an external peer reviewer and written report, including recommendations for improvement. Externally accredited programs do not utilize an external peer reviewer. Additionally, after appropriate pre-vetting and approval by the PRC, in lieu of the University's program review document, accredited programs may submit their accreditation report, findings letter (from the site visitors) and their response letter (action plan) for review by the PRC. Any APU-specific element not addressed in external accreditation must be appended.
5. Constituent feedback is a critical source of information that informs the reflection. Stakeholders such as current students, alumni, applied learning supervisors, employers, and other constituents must be included in the provision of feedback. (CFR 4.5).
6. Systematic program review is a process required by the regional accrediting agency, the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WSCUC).

“All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.” (CFR 2.7, WASC Handbook of Accreditation, 2013).

1.2. Accountability for Program Review

Program review is a faculty-governed and university-owned process. As such, there are a variety of constituencies who have accountability to the process.

The APU faculty, through the Undergraduate, Master's, and Doctoral Studies Councils and corresponding Program Review Committees (PRCs)—undergraduate, master's, and doctoral—are responsible for determining program review standards, as well as reviewing and evaluating current academic programs to ensure that those standards are met. Council and PRC actions fall under the governance of the Faculty Senate.

Designated staff in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) are responsible for providing data to programs and working with the councils to coordinate the overall program review process on the university's behalf. Specifically, the Director of Curricular Effectiveness serves as the administrative contact for the program review process by helping departments connect annual assessments with the program review cycle, collaborating with programs to provide the most accurate and meaningful data, sending out program review notifications, distributing program review materials, maintaining the program review master schedule, monitoring the various program review processes, and archiving past program review reports. Close communication among programs, PRCs, OIRA, and the Director is vital to sustaining an efficient and clear program review process.

The program's department chair or program director and the full-time faculty in the program undergoing review share the responsibility for conducting the review and preparing a report. The department chair or program director may organize and accomplish the review in a manner she/he thinks most appropriate but retains the overall responsibility for completing the review on schedule. All full-time program faculty should be involved in and able to discuss the results of program review.

The academic administration of the university is responsible for reviewing program reviews and determining the best way to support program improvement, including but not limited to budgetary and resource support that is available to the program. Department Chairs and Deans should be utilizing program review findings to inform strategic planning and budgeting at the department, school/college, and university level.

1.3. Clarifying Program Review Committees and their Work

Program Review Committee (PRC)

Each council (undergraduate, master's, doctoral) oversees the program review process for its respective academic level by selecting a standing Program Review Committee (PRC), which consists of at least one member from the council who chairs the committee and whose membership must meet the qualifications as described below. The PRC is responsible for evaluating the quality of each academic program, as well as for providing a recommendation to accept or not accept a program review to its respective council.

Program Review Committee Membership Criteria

The guidelines for PRC membership are identified below:

- Committee membership normally includes 3 to 5 faculty members. Every effort is made to have representation across schools and colleges. In cases where a program to which a PRC member belongs is scheduled for review, the PRC member must recuse her-/himself from all official evaluation of that program.
- At least one PRC member (the chair) must come from the council. Other qualified PRC members may be selected from faculty at the same level (e.g., doctoral) within or outside the council.
- As stated in the *APU Faculty Handbook*, ex-officio members may be appointed by the council or PRC as needed. Additionally, programs undergoing review may request the addition of a specific faculty member from an outside department to join the team reviewing their specific program.
- Per WASC guidelines, one PRC member should have expertise or training in outcomes assessment, in order to evaluate the quality of student learning outcomes and assessment strategies utilized by the program undergoing review (note: the external reviewer, if utilized, or a specially appointed faculty member may serve in this role).

Authority of the Program Review Committee

As stated in the *APU Faculty Handbook*, each PRC is charged with assessing and documenting the effectiveness of the program curriculum at its level to ensure that program goals are being met. This charge is carried out via program review. In this regard, the PRC has the authority to request edits to a Program Review Report when the submitted work fails to address required components of the report, provides incomplete or inaccurate information, reaches faulty conclusions, or fails to identify appropriate goals in light of the evidence provided in the report. In all cases, requests for edits are made through the lens of program improvement and should be clearly communicated in a timely and collegial fashion. These edits are requested prior to any formal evaluation of the report and should not be included as part of the PRC's final report (see below) unless they remain unaddressed by the program. Once requests for edits have been made by a PRC, a program may choose to respond by making requested edits or by providing further rationale for the contents of the report. No more than two weeks should transpire between a PRC request for edits and the submission of a revised report.

Communicating the Results of Program Review

Once a program has responded to the request for edits and submitted its final version of the Program Review Report, the PRC completes the Program Review Committee Report and Rubric for Assessing Program Quality. In these documents, PRCs are expected to comment, with recommended action steps, on the quality of the academic program and the appropriateness of the program's conclusions. The PRC may also identify goals it believes may facilitate program improvement in the future but may not require action by the program as a contingency for approving a program report.

As part of the communication process, the PRC is required to share its findings and recommendations to the program undergoing review and may offer a face-to-face meeting with the program faculty or a program representative. Programs have opportunity at that time to correct errors of fact before the PRC report is sent to the council for a final vote. If there are disagreements related to the PRC recommendation, a program may request, in writing, the opportunity to appear at the council meeting when the program review is scheduled for council action and may ask for council intervention to remedy the disagreement. The council will summarize the program's request in writing, make a ruling and note its action as part of the minutes of the meeting.

The council receives a PRC's final report and rubric, along with the recommendation to approve or not approve the program review, and votes an official response, which is communicated to both the Director of Curricular Effectiveness and to the Faculty Senate (via council minutes).

Once a program is approved by the council¹, all program review materials are made available by the Director of Curricular Effectiveness to the dean. The dean reviews all relevant materials and meets with program faculty to share his/her perspective. Following the face-to-face meeting, each dean records his/her official findings in the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding which is returned to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness and made available to the program faculty and the appropriate vice provost. Once the program reviews for a school are complete, the dean will meet with the Provost to summarize the findings. In conjunction with the strategic planning process, program review materials are considered by The Administrative Cabinet (TAC) to inform budgeting and strategic planning decisions.

Mid-Cycle Status Reports

It is the purview of the PRC to ensure that programs have evaluated their progress towards meeting identified goals by reviewing their Mid-Cycle Status Report and presenting their evaluation of this progress to their appropriate Studies Council.

¹ If a program is not approved by the Council, a meeting with the program faculty, dean, council chair and PRC chair is scheduled to resolve differences. In rare instances, the Office of the Provost may be asked to render a final decision.

Making Changes to Program Review

In addition to review of each program, the PRC and its council also recommend, review, and propose changes to the program review handbook and template. To accomplish this, all proposed program review changes are sent in advance to each PRC, whose members then provide opportunity for feedback from its council. Following a review period not to exceed 3 weeks, a joint council meeting takes place to vote on recommended changes to the program review process. The meeting is scheduled and attended by the Director of Curricular Effectiveness (from the CTLA), who serves in a non-voting, ex-officio capacity, and must include at the minimum each PRC chair and one other designated representative from either the PRC or the council (typically the council chairperson). Each council may determine the appropriate number of attendees to send to the meeting. All changes to program review are finalized at the joint council level and recorded in a set of meeting minutes that are communicated to each council and sent by the Director of Curricular Effectiveness to the Faculty Senate for senate approval. All approved changes to program review documents are made by the Director of Curricular Effectiveness.

1.4. Program Review Cycle

Academic programs are scheduled to conduct a program review and write a report on a seven-year rotating cycle, or concurrent with external professional accreditation (see 1.5. below), with a Mid-Cycle Status Report due 3 years from the date the report was prepared. New programs are scheduled for review following an initial five-year developmental period. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, via The Director of Curricular Effectiveness, maintains the Program Review Master Schedule. The schedule is a flexible document and undergoes changes from time to time, with permission of the Director. (The current schedule is available on the APU website: www.apu.edu/oira) Requests for extensions or changes to the Program Review Master Schedule must be approved by the Dean of the program and the Director Curricular Effectiveness. Changes are not final until reflected on the Program Review Master Schedule.

Extensions on Program Review Reports do not result in altering the long-term Program Review Master Schedule. Programs which are granted an extension must still meet the date/year the next program review is due.

1.5. Program Review and External Accrediting Agency

Academic programs with external professional accreditation (at the program level) may be exempt from most of the program review process. All programs seeking exemption must be vetted through the respective PRC at least a year in advance of the time the program is scheduled to submit a program review. This is accomplished by submitting a completed pre-vetting worksheet and recent accreditation report to the PRC, at which point the PRC will validate to what extent a program is exempt from APU's program review

process. This validation will also determine if any APU program review components or requirements are not included in the accreditation report for which the program must provide this additional information. If a program is determined to be exempt or partially exempt, that program must submit any pre-identified APU-specific elements of the report, the professional accreditation report, findings letter (from the site visitors) and the program's response letter (action plan) for review by the PRC. Regardless of exemption status, all programs must produce an action plan and a mid-cycle status report. Deans still provide an Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding as part of the process.

1.6. Program Review External Reviewers

Academic programs *not* accredited by an external accrediting agency are required to utilize an outside (external to APU) reviewer who reviews program materials and submits a written analysis as part of the review process. In the spring prior to the program review, the department chair or program director is responsible for identifying a qualified reviewer and completing the External Reviewer Request and Authorization Form. Stipend amounts for the external reviewer are determined by the dean and funded through the provost's office. Once a reviewer is selected and approved, the Office of the Provost manages the necessary paperwork for hiring the external reviewer.

According to standards proposed by the WASC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review, external reviewers should meet the following criteria:

- Distinguished scholar/teacher/practitioner in the field
- Chosen from a campus similar to APU
- When possible, experienced with program administration
- When possible, experienced with assessing student learning outcomes
- Familiar with APU's mission and purpose

External reviewers are selected in advance of program review but are utilized after the review has been written. With the permission of the Dean, external reviewers may visit the campus in order to verify materials that are referenced by the program and to interview faculty, students, and administrators in order to obtain the most accurate information. Campus visits should be scheduled within two weeks of receiving a program's materials (unless over a holiday period), and the report should be submitted within two weeks of a campus visit. In the event a site visit is necessary, all travel expenses for bringing the external reviewer to campus are to be covered from the program's budget unless negotiated differently with the dean.

The external reviewer completes the External Reviewer Report as well as the Rubric for Assessing a Program Quality and submits it to the department chair/program director who then sends to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness. The Director of Curricular

Effectiveness then makes it available to the Program Review Committee (PRC) chair to be included as part of the Program Review Report.

1.7. Timely Completion of Program Review

All attempts are made by the university to support the timely completion of program reviews. In addition to having access to the 7-year Program Review Master Schedule, programs are given access to their program data well in advance of the due date. Because the university is striving to incorporate program review results into the strategic planning and budgeting processes, it is in a program's best interest to complete the review by the date assigned, so that the identified needs may be considered in this process. When a department or program fails to complete its required program review within the expected time limits, sanctions may occur. At the council level, the program may be placed on moratorium and not permitted to bring curricular proposals or other matters before the appropriate council until the report is approved by the PRC. Programs submitting late reviews will not be granted extensions on the subsequent review due date but will be expected to complete their next review as scheduled.

2. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Program review is a systematic process completed in five phases: 1) preparing for the program review, 2) writing the report, 3) reviewing and evaluating the report, 4) responding to the findings of program review, and 5) reporting on the progress following the review. The process is described below and is also summarized with timelines in [Table One](#).

2.1 PHASE ONE: Preparing for the Program Review

Phase One begins when the department receives notification from the Director of Curricular Effectiveness, during the preceding fall semester, that they are scheduled to complete a program review during the fall semester of the *next* academic year. The dean of the school or college in which the program resides also receives notification.

The Director of Curricular Effectiveness, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), ensures that the department chair/program director has a copy of the Program Review Handbook and Program Review Report Template (also available at www.apu.edu/oira) and all data necessary for analysis. Data not yet available will be identified and a plan for securing that data will be communicated to the program. In some cases, complete data will not be available, and programs may need to supplement required tables with their own data.

Soon after notification of review, the Director of Curricular Effectiveness will set up a meeting with the department chair/program director to:

- Discuss initial data needs with OIRA staff
- Discuss the review process
- Clarify requirements for the written report
- Make clear any assistance provided in preparing, conducting, and reporting the review
- Discuss the projected timeline for completing the program review
- Help the program develop a strategy for completing the review and meeting the expected due date

For non-accredited programs, the department chair/program director and faculty will identify a qualified external reviewer and acquire appropriate approvals for hiring him or her (see [Section 1.6](#) for details).

Programs are strongly encouraged to begin the program review process in spring so that reports can be submitted on time in the fall.

2.2 PHASE TWO: Writing the Report

The program faculty, in consultation with the Director of Curricular Effectiveness and OIRA, complete the Program Review Report Template (under separate cover), submitting an electronic copy to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness, who then sends an electronic copy to the chair of the Program Review Committee. For non-accredited programs, the external reviewer also completes her or his report and submits it to the department chair/program director. Programs should allot at least one month prior to submission of the final report for the department chair and dean to review the final draft (see [Table One](#) for “The Program Review General Timeline”). Prior to submission to the director, the department chair and/or the program director, all full-time faculty teaching in the program, and the school/college dean sign the final draft of the Program Review Report. Signatures from the faculty and the dean signify a working knowledge of the program review findings but do not authorize the review as approved. Studies councils are the bodies authorized to approve program reviews, after which the dean will provide an official response with a Memorandum of Understanding (see [Phase Four](#)).

2.3 PHASE THREE: Reviewing and Evaluating the Report

Upon receipt of the finished and signed report (as well as the External Reviewer Report), the Director of Curricular Effectiveness ensures that a copy has been received by the members of the PRC so they can evaluate the quality of the report. Interim requests for edits by the PRC are made in a timely fashion (see [Section 1.3](#)). Once final edits are made, the PRC completes the Program

Review Committee Report, attaches the Rubric for Assessing Program Quality and presents its findings back to the program faculty. It then makes a recommendation to the appropriate council whether or not to approve the report.

The council votes on the recommendation of the PRC, thereby making a final decision on the program review, and minutes reflecting action on the program review are forwarded to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness and the Senate. Once council approval is acquired, all updated materials are forwarded to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness, who then forwards the materials and the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding to the dean for an official response (see Phase Four below).

2.4 PHASE FOUR: Responding to the Findings of Program Review

After the Program Review Report is completed and approved by the appropriate council, an administrative response is initiated. The Director of Curricular Effectiveness forwards completed and approved program reviews, with the PRC Report, and attaches a copy of the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding (Appendix C) to the dean of the school/college undergoing review. After receiving the PRC report and its recommendations, the dean meets with the program undergoing review to discuss findings and then responds with written feedback and budget allocations (as appropriate) for accomplishing the program goals, with recommended action steps. As appropriate, the dean incorporates program goals into the school's/college's strategic plan so that long-term resource needs are addressed as part of the budgeting process. The dean returns her or his completed Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness for further dissemination.

Following the dean's response, the Director of Curricular Effectiveness forwards fully executed copies to the dean, department chair, and program director of the program undergoing review.

Responses from the dean are sent to the appropriate vice provost so that they may be considered by The Administrative Cabinet (TAC) when making long-term academic resource allocations, and decisions by TAC are communicated back to the dean.

2.5 PHASE FIVE: Reporting on the Progress of the Review

On behalf of the appropriate PRC, the Director of Curricular Effectiveness initiates and facilitates the Mid-Cycle Status Report process. Assuming that interim deadlines are met by all parties involved during the academic year of review, Mid-Cycle Status Reports are due at the conclusion of the fall semester that falls 3 years after initial reports are written and 2.5 years after they are reviewed by the administration. This gives programs two academic years to start implementing changes and six months to evaluate the effectiveness of those changes.

The primary purpose for the Mid-Cycle Status Report is to describe the short-term progress made in implementing the identified program goals with recommended action steps and to re-visit the administrative response. The department completes the Mid-Cycle Status Report and submits it to the dean for a response and signature. Once the dean has responded, the Mid-Cycle Status Report is sent to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness, who forwards the document to the PRC chair.

The PRC reviews and comments on the Mid-Cycle Status Report. If the report is acceptable, this fact appears in the PRC's minutes sent forward to the appropriate council for approval, and the report is filed with the Director of Curricular Effectiveness. The Director of Curricular Effectiveness also distributes the report to the chair of the PRC and to the department chair and program director of the program submitting the report.

As a part of the ongoing process of assessment, all academic programs continue to assess student learning outcomes and engage in strategic planning on an annual basis via the program's TaskStream account. These annual processes serve to inform the next program review.

3. Components of the Program Review Report

The following is a brief overview of the components required in the Program Review Report. These components meet WASC criteria as identified in the WASC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review (2009) and represent best practices in higher education assessment.

Programs are not expected to have fully achieved maximum quality for all the components, but instead, the review should address each component with a thorough, evidence-based, and accurate analysis.

The overall structure of the Program Review Report is articulated below but does not contain all the elements required of programs. The Program Review Report Template is available under separate cover and must be used as the basis for the document provided by each program under review.

3.1 Cover Sheet, Faculty/Dean Verification and Table of Contents

The report starts with an identifying cover sheet, followed by a verification page with faculty and dean signatures and a table of

contents, identifying the starting location of each major component.

3.2 Response to the Components

Programs will utilize multiple years of program data to evaluate the quality with which their program operates as it relates to each of four components, briefly described below. (See Program Review Report Template for all of the elements of the program review components.)

NOTE: The data needed for program review will be provided to the fullest extent possible by the OIRA, in the form of a completed tables, which may be utilized and referenced in your report. Data collection for faculty and student enrollment will end by November 1 for faculty and October 15 for students of the year prior to the submission of the report. Programs may choose to update data beyond November 1 or October 15 of the year prior to the submission of the report. Data collection for student completion, GPA, and class size will end by June 30 of the year prior to the submission of the report. Programs may need to supplement the tables with information unavailable to the OIRA. In such cases, programs must specify collection methods and dates (or date ranges).

Component A - Curriculum

Programs will describe where the program fits within the university structure (e.g., school/dept.) and what degrees or concentrations it grants. The program's mission and purpose, and how it helps to fulfill the broader mission of APU will be discussed. Trends in higher education as they relate to the need for the program will be identified, along with a competitor analysis. A thorough analysis of the curriculum requirements and the degree to which the curriculum adequately and thoroughly addresses program student learning outcomes is required in this section. Programs will also address the extent to which their program advances faith integration, WASC core competencies, and general education learning outcomes.

Component B - Student Learning and Success

Programs will evaluate the effectiveness of their assessment cycle to improve student learning, as well as how well students have achieved each program learning outcome. Programs will evaluate the program's ability to attract students who fit the program mission and who successfully graduate from the program. Student and alumni accomplishments will be identified as indicators of program success, and enrollment trends will be discussed as they relate to successful recruitment and retention. Programs will report any data and feedback that have been provided from students, alumni and/or supervisors as to the program's ability to

prepare successful graduates. Additionally, the program will discuss ways in which student, alumni, and supervisor feedback is utilized in the assessment of program quality, as well as the program's effectiveness at communicating and responding to the results discovered during program review

Component C - Quality of Faculty

Programs will evaluate the academic preparation and qualifications of faculty who teach in the program, as well the scholarly accomplishments that have contributed to program quality. Teaching effectiveness across delivery systems will be evaluated in light of the faculty development opportunities and mentoring available to faculty. Distribution of workload and course distribution across faculty classification will be analyzed in terms of overall program effectiveness.

Component D - Program Viability and Sustainability

Programs will engage in a resource and capacity analysis as it relates to use of past resources, as well as resources still needed by the program. Budget trends will also be analyzed.

Component E - Analysis of Program Strengths, Areas for Growth, and Action Plan

The process of identifying program strengths, areas for growth, and future goals is the culminating phase of academic program review and the starting point for the next review period. Its purpose is to identify an action plan in such a way that progress toward implementing the plan can be assessed for the next round of program review. Programs will provide summary conclusions as to the program's areas of strength and need for improvement based on the program review and will identify specific goals with recommendations for making necessary change. Recommendations will include an associated action or outcome that needs to occur in order to meet the goal. The PRC and dean will respond to this analysis.

3.3 Additional Documentation

The following materials are typically included as elements of the program review. Others may be added as necessary.

- Program Analysis with Recommended Action Steps from prior Program Review Report
- Mid-Cycle Status Report
- Administrative Response to Program Goals and Memorandum of Understanding from prior Program Review Report
- Overall Multi-year Assessment Plan from TaskStream
- Annual Assessment Reports (since the last program review) from TaskStream

3.4 External Reviewer Report

Non-accredited programs must utilize an external reviewer who evaluates the program as a supplement to the PRC (see [Section 1.6](#) for more detail). The External Reviewer's Report must be submitted to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness, which forwards the report to the PRC reviewing the program.

3.5 Program Review Committee Report with Rubric

PRC members will complete a report and utilize a rubric to communicate the overall quality of the program review. After reporting its findings and recommendations to the program faculty, the PRC will forward its recommendation to the Studies Council for official action on the program review.

3.6 Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding

Once approved through faculty governance processes, the dean will respond by completing the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding providing an analysis of resources available to accomplish program recommendations.

3.7 Mid-Cycle Status Report

Programs complete a brief report, updating progress made toward achieving program recommendations. The Mid-Cycle Status Report is typically due 3 years following an approved program review report and is reviewed by the dean and PRC.

Table One: The Program Review General Timeline

| | | |
|--|-------------|---|
| <p>PHASE ONE:</p> <p>Preparing for Review</p> <p>•</p> <p>Fall/Spring semester prior to Program Review</p> | November 1 | Programs scheduled for upcoming review are notified by the Director of Curricular Effectiveness and begin working with programs to collect alumni data. |
| | February 15 | Members of OIRA and the Director of Curricular Effectiveness meets with the department chair/program director to determine needs, communicate expectations, and provided all available university data. Department begins organizing for program review. |
| <p>PHASES TWO through FOUR:</p> <p>Preparing and Approving the Report; Administrative Response and Memorandum of</p> | June 15 | Department/program selects and receives approval for hiring an external reviewer (if applicable). |
| | December 15 | Program faculty provides materials to external reviewer and completes the Program Review Report. Programs should allow at least one month prior to December 15 for dean's review. Program Review Report, with dean's signature, is submitted to the Director of Curricular Effectiveness; report is distributed to the members of PRC. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Understanding • The academic year in which the Program Review is completed | March 15 | PRC examines the report and the external reviewer's report, asks for interim-level edits (when necessary) and reports its findings to the program. PRC then makes a recommendation (accept or not accept) to the associated council. |
| | April 15 | Council votes on recommendation to approve or not approve and records its actions in the council minutes, which are approved and forwarded to the Senate and the Director of Curricular Effectiveness. |
| | June 15 | The Director of Curricular Effectiveness sends finalized materials to dean for the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding. Dean meets with program to discuss findings, potential resource allocations, and completes Memorandum of Understanding. Program reviews are referenced by academic administration in future budgeting discussions. |
| PHASE FIVE: Mid-Cycle Status Report and Continuous Assessments • Post-Program Review | Two years following report approval | Programs continue to assess student learning outcomes and engage in strategic planning annually. Programs implement recommendations with action steps and assess the effectiveness of program changes. |
| | December 15 (3 years following review) | Programs submit a Mid-Cycle Status Report identifying progress made toward achieving program goals, as well as any challenges that still remain. Dean and PRC reviews and responds. |