Program Review Instructions

University Program Review

Program review is organized around the preparation and review of a self‐study that is intended to create a thoughtful assessment of the quality of academic programs and to establish goals for continuous improvement. The process of reviewing these studies (which includes faculty, the deans, the University Program Review committee, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Provost) is expected to strengthen the academic programs as well as identify program needs and campus priorities.

On a four (4) ‐year cycle each academic unit prepares a self‐study (see *Program Review: Annual Timeline).* The process: Begins in *December* when the Office of Academic Affairs offers a workshop for chairs and assessment coordinators and continues until *April 1st* when the studies are submitted to the College Dean. Thereafter, the studies are reviewed by the respective College Dean, discussed between the Dean and program and/or department chair, and then a review letter is completed by the Dean (one letter per self-study). The review with letter is then submitted to the Graduate School Dean by *May 15th.* The Graduate School Dean reviews the documents and consults with the Dean by *August 1st*. The Graduate School Dean has the option to attach a letter with additional comment and information as needed.The University Program Review committee then reviews the reports (*Sept. 1-Nov. 1*). These reviews are then presented to the department chairs and college deans *Nov. 15th-Dec. 1st.* Each unit is provided with an opportunity to discuss and clarify those reviews. The University committee submits its final report to the Provost by *December 5th*.

Deans and chairs will have access to a statistical overview of each program based on the KBOR format and prepared by the Office of Planning and Analysis. This includes: student credit hours, faculty load data, numbers of majors, graduation numbers, and ACT data. In preparing the self‐ study the academic units need to be aware of the Board of Regents program standards for the number of majors, number of degrees granted annually, number of faculty supporting a program, and the quality of undergraduate students as determined by the standardized test scores. Programs that are triggered for not meeting program minima will need to address those concerns in the report.1

Other types of information, however, are more directly related to measuring program quality and improvement and provide information that enables academic units to develop goals. Programs are encouraged to consider the use of SMART Goals (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time‐bound goals) and all goals should be tied to the university and college strategic plans. These include student learning assessment data, data on placement of graduates, recommendations from accreditation reports, the efforts and results for recruiting and retaining faculty and students, an assessment of faculty research, teaching and service, and sources of external support. These types of information are created and employed at the unit level.

Kansas Board of Regents Program Review

The goals of assessing programs at the system level include ensuring that programs are consistent with institutional missions and roles; ensuring optimal student access and use of resources; minimizing duplication; and encouraging institutional cooperation.

The Board of Regents criteria for review are as follows:

* *Centrality to the university mission*
* *Strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty*
* *Curriculum and impact on students*
* *Student need and employer demand*
* *Service provided by the program*
* *Overall program quality*

The work of the University Program Review committee is to produce an evaluation of programs for each of these criteria. Based on the four (4) ‐year reviews, the Office of Academic Affairs reports to the Board of Regents following an eight (8) ‐year cycle. The report summarizes the findings of the four (4) ‐year reviews and makes recommendations on whether a program should be enhanced, maintained, monitored for improvement, or discontinued. Modifications to programs, such as mergers can also be recommended. The schedule for the current and next eight (8) ‐year cycle (2018‐2026) can be found in *Program Review: Cycle for Reporting* (<http://wichita.edu/assessment>).1

For the remainder of the current KBOR eight (8) ‐year cycle (2015 ‐ 2023), the four‐year schedule for program review will be set to accommodate accreditation cycles as much as possible.

The Self‐Study

Departments are asked to report using a standard template to enable the university to develop consistency in the process as well as to promote a thoughtful analysis of data for making decisions. **The narrative should be concise: not more than a total of 20 pages (not including appended materials)**. Tables are provided for reporting standard data but departments are encouraged to append additional charts and tables to concisely present the results of their study within their 20 page limit.

The template consists of five parts. Each part consists of the relevant data and charts and a narrative. The following instructions should be followed to complete the template most effectively.

# Coversheet:

The coversheet includes information that identifies the academic unit and should be completed thoroughly. The dates of last review and accreditation should be included along with each of the degrees offered by the department.

**Signature Pages:**

All faculty should print and sign their name, indicate their status related to tenure, and mark their contribution to the preparation of the self-study. These contributions can include the preparation of one or more sections of the report and/or the opportunity to review and provide feedback before the final document is submitted to the Dean. The signatures indicate that each faculty has read the self-study template and agreed (by consensus) to its contents. The self‐study should be signed by the submitting department chair. **Forms not completed properly will be returned to the sending department.**

In addition to faculty and department chair signatures, the Dean of the college and Graduate School Dean will need to review the self-study and provide their signatures as well as acknowledgements as appropriate.

**Part 1. Departmental Purpose, Relationship to the University Mission and Strategic Plan** (*what the unit does, why it does it and how does it’s work relate to the university mission )*

1. Provide an overall description of the program.
2. Insert the program’s purpose statement.
3. Describe in a few paragraphs the focus (purpose) of the department and how it relates to the university’s mission, as well as the role of the institution, college, and community. If the program has a different purpose statement for each program, please state that here.
4. Discuss how the department/program supports the university strategic plan.

# Part 2. Faculty Quality and Productivity as a Factor for Program Quality

Part 2 should describe how well the Program accomplishes teaching, research, and service objectives in relation to the workload policy for the program (unit). Briefly describe the quality of the faculty teaching, research/scholarship, service, and extension/outreach activities.

A table for scholarly production is included and should be populated. *Each unit should add, where relevant, quantitative data that measures scholarly productivity* *and how it is linked to program enhancements.* Recognizing the differences among academic disciplines, append tables, charts, or descriptions that summarize discipline‐specific information. If the program has different faculty teaching in different programs, then complete additional tables as appropriate for each program. If most faculty teach at all levels, then only one table is needed.

Consider:

* List the standards in place for faculty research/scholarship/creativity (e.g. 2 publications and $50,000 in grant funding per academic year)
* How does the department (discipline) determine the quality and productivity of its faculty?
* What data and criteria are most useful to the department for creating improvements?
* Efforts to recruit and retain faculty and the success of those efforts.
* Faculty loads and how they are determined.
* Commenting on the meaning of the data presented in the data fields.
* What is the workload distribution for the faculty within the program as related to the workload policy? Provide table/visual for the roles within the department and/or add narrative as needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **# of Faculty** | **Teaching**  | **Service** | **Scholarship** | **Administration** |
| 5 faculty members | 75% | 0% | 25% | 0% |
| 3 faculty members | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% |
| 1 faculty member | 0% | 10% | 10% | 80% |

Example of workload distribution:

# Part 3. Academic Program(s) and Emphasis

Part 3 should describe the overall quality of each program offered by the department as it relates to the curriculum and its impact on students. This section should be prepared for each CIP degree. Cover all levels of the CIP degree: Undergraduate, Master's and Doctoral.

* 1. Data will be provided that compares the average ACT scores of the undergraduate program(s) with University averages ACTs or with those of similar programs (e.g. humanities, health programs, etc.).
	2. For graduate programs, data will be provided comparing the entering GPAs with other graduate programs.
	3. Provide the current [Specialty Accreditation](https://www.wichita.edu/administration/assessment/AccreditationReport.php) status for the program, if applicable. List NA if not applicable.
	4. Present the major student learner outcomes for each program and how the outcomes are measured. Briefly describe the results for the past three years. Present what program changes were made as a result of the assessment (feedback loop.)

Also in this section, if applicable, describe the results of any licensing or certification exams program graduates take (percent passing compared to national passing rates).

Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome as presented in section d along with the proposed actions the program will take based on the results.

* 1. List any student satisfaction surveys, alumni surveys, or employer surveys done in the past three years that have provided the program with feedback. With each survey, please indicate the number of respondents, response rate, and the overall results.
	2. For undergraduate programs: complete this section as applicable to the program(s) offered.
	3. For programs who offer concurrent enrollment only – Describe assessment activity over the last four years. Activities should address grading standards, course management instructional delivery. Provide assurance that content meets or exceeds those in regular campus sections.
	4. Describe the process used to assign credit hours to courses. Responses should refer to WSU policy 2.18.
	5. In the narrative provide an overall quality of the academic program using the data in this section and elsewhere. Suggested items for inclusion are:
		+ Describe the quality of those admitted to the program and how admission requirements are determined, for example, standardized test scores.
		+ Include a description of student awards; students presenting or publishing original research or creative work; co‐op work experiences; participation in professional societies and development opportunities; teaching evaluations of GTAs.
		+ Regional, national, or international ranking among comparable degree programs if appropriate.
		+ Reflect on the learner outcomes. What data are most useful to the unit for improving learner outcomes?

# Part 4. Enrollment Management

Refer to student need and demand using the data from OPA Tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis to complete this section.

# List and Triggered programs and reason. List NA if not applicable.

# Part A. Student Need and Employer Demand

Refer to student need and demand using the data from OPA Tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis to complete this section.

1. Complete Table 4 (Employment of Majors) for each program.
2. Provide an explanation of the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find. Programs that are triggered for graduates or majors should get particular attention.
3. Summarize the available data within the table. Race/ethnicity data will be provided for the majors in each level program. Use the narrative to reflect on the data and address:
	* 1. The student need for the CIP degree using the data from the table as appropriate.
		2. Employment demand for students. For each program cite placement data including positions secured, starting salaries, proportion of graduates placed at graduation.
		3. Provide information on alumni or employer surveys about placement, salary, needs, etc. for the different program levels.
		4. Number or percentage of graduates who go on to enroll in graduate degree programs.

**Part B. Recruitment and Retention**

1. Undergraduate Graduate Enrollment Management: For each undergraduate program, reflect on activities undertaken in the department to support the strategic enrollment goals of the university. Specify success undertaken with special populations, (minoritized students, first‐gen, women in STEM). Highlight faculty who have served as recruitment or retention fellows. Provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with those activities.
2. Graduate Enrollment Plan: For each graduate program, include progress made on the G-PIPER plan (Graduate Program Investment Plan for Enrollment and Research). Briefly describe how the department and faculty have engaged in graduate strategic enrollment management (G-PIPER) including recruitment and retention activities and provide an assessment of successes, challenges, and deficiencies with those activities.
3. Provide an overview for each program, including the current number of majors within the program for each of the academic years since the last review; number of graduates for each of the academic years since the last review; and student enrollment, degree production, and employment outcomes for URM students.

Additional items to address in this section of the report:

* + - Average time from admission to graduation. (NISS Recommendation)
		- Retention and completion rates. (NISS Recommendation)
		- Enrollment, retention, and completion rates by race/ethnicity. (NISS Recommendation)
		- Addressing DFW courses in program/department as identified in WSU Reporting (OPA-0008 At Risk Report)

# Part C. Program and Faculty Service

The table will include the percentage of student credit hours generated by the department as taken by the program majors and the percentage taken by non‐majors. This data provides the program with data about the level of service the program provides to students outside of their specific programs.

In the narrative, reflect on the data and present:

* The service provided to other programs.
* A description of interdisciplinary or cross‐disciplinary teaching done by the program faculty.
* A description of collaborative research, internal and external
* An analysis of SCH by majors and non‐majors.
* A description of the sources and amount of external financial support for the program as well as the purpose of that support. For example, program grants, research grants, faculty development, etc.
* Program uniqueness that would account for the amount of monies needed, such as teaching methods, accreditation limitations, and so on.

# Part 5. Summary and Recommendations

# Program Goals from Last Review

During the program review, four years ago, the program developed a set of aspirational and measurable goals. Please list the goals and the progress made towards achievement, including the data used to analyze progress and the outcomes. Any goals marked as continuous should be listed again under the forward facing goals section.

# **Impact of Previous Self-Study Recommendations**

Describe where the Program (s) have been and where they are going. What are the plans to advance the program (s), how will future progress be evaluated?

Options for additional narrative, as appropriate:

* Evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for the program based on the data available. (SWOT analysis - (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats)
* List recommendations from previous reviews and accreditation reports and describe progress on implementing those recommendations.
* Describe unique opportunities, comparative advantages, and future research opportunities.
* Address the adequacy of resources.
* If the program is being monitored for not meeting KBOR minima criteria; explain low numbers of graduates, low graduation rates, retention problems, and plans to address?

**Forward-Facing Goals**

Identify measurable goal(s) (aspirational and measurable) for the program for the next four years. These should be goals the program will work to accomplish in time for the next review. Consider use of SMART goals (**Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-bound)** when appropriate. All goals for the next four years should be tied to the university and college strategic plans.