SCHEDULE FOR IN-DEPTH PROGRAM REVIEWS

AY   **DEPARTMENT**   **Final Reports are due in June**

2009-2010   Chemistry, History, Mathematical Sciences, Mathematical Sciences
Math Lab

2010-2011   English, Religious Studies

2011-2012   WAC, Philosophy, Languages and Cultures, Ross Language Lab

2012-2013   Biological Sciences, Physics

2013-2014   Psychological Sciences, Program in the Environment, Center for Latin
American and Caribbean Studies, Walker Percy Center for Writing and
Publishing

There will be internal department reviews five years after an external review to evaluate
progress toward responding to the external review.
Revised 9/15/11

The primary purpose of the Program Review process is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the current status of a program based on its activities and achievements since its last program review. Reviews of programs provide an opportunity to identify strengths and weaknesses in the provision of quality services; support of the educational (learning) outcomes of the university; contributions in accomplishing the Jesuit mission of the university; and special features or services provided by the unit.

Program reviews should allow the unit to plan to build on existing strengths, maximize opportunities for growth, and solve current problems. The reviews should lead to more effective planning which should be linked to the budgeting process.

Support program reviews allow the unit to thoroughly and candidly evaluate:

      the mission and goals of the program and its relation to those of the college and university.
      support of the educational objectives, curriculum, and student learning outcomes of college.
      resources (e.g., library, physical facilities, and technology in support of teaching and research).
      readiness for accreditation, if appropriate.

The guiding principles for program reviews include:

      Program review should provide a candid assessment of program strengths and weaknesses and should result in program improvement. To this end, the self-study report should move beyond a program description toward a systematic program evaluation.
      The process should be broadly participatory involving faculty, students, staff administrators, alumni, and other relevant stakeholders.
      The program review should provide a framework for excellence; an opportunity to explore, enhance, and integrate student learning and faculty teaching, service, and scholarly/creative efforts into the mission and goals of the program.
      The process should facilitate short-term and long-term strategic planning in areas such as curricular development, resource allocation (e.g., financial, physical), as well as faculty/staff hiring and workload.
      The program review process allows the college to account for its use of university resources and develop support among its various constituencies.

Results of program reviews along with other assessment results will be utilized by the HNS College Planning Team in the development of Five-Year Plans and financial planning for the College.

Program Review Procedures And Self-Study Document

The academic program reviews consist of four phases including the preparatory phase, the development of the self-evaluation and development of revised action plans based on reviewers' recommendations.

> Phase I. Preparatory Phase Phase II. Self-Study Report: Development and Preparation Phase III The Site-Visit and Site Visit Report   (not required; recommended) Phase III. Program Report

Phase I. Preparatory Phase

A. **Notification** In May of the academic year prior to the review year, the dean will notify, the chair/director/coordinator of the program to be reviewed that a review has been scheduled.

B. **Self-Evaluation Committee** The program to be reviewed, according to its own protocols, will select a self-study committee of the whole. The self-study committee will be responsible for organizing and conducting the review process and for preparing the self-evaluation report.

C. **Meet with Dean** Once a committee is appointed, the chair/director/coordinator and self-evaluation committee will meet with the dean to discuss any requests for specific information/issues that the dean would like included in the self-study.

D. **Library Contact** For academic program reviews the library should be contacted at least three months prior to the development of the self-study to provide sufficient time to generate data about the program's library resources.

E. **Nomination of Site Visitors**   Whether or not there is a site visit depends on departmental needs, recommendations from the dean, and available funding. The chairperson of the program to be reviewed, in consultation with the self-evaluation committee and the departmental/program faculty, should submit a list of names and qualifications of potential external academic reviewers with relevant expertise.   The dean, in consultation with the department or program, will select the external academic reviewers from the list of names provided.

Phase II. Self-Study Report: Development and Preparation

A. **Document Preparation** The Self-Evaluation Report is an interpretive document that uses data to assess current program status and future directions (see page 4 for a detailed description of the Self- Study Document). Data should be analyzed and discussed in relation to the program's mission and goals. Although the report is compiled and written by the self-study committee, the chair/director/coordinator of the program is responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the work and should actively oversee the report preparation.

B. **Document Distribution**

The Self-Evaluation Report, together with an executive summary, should be forwarded to the dean, who will review it for content, completeness, and accuracy. When necessary, suggested changes/improvements will be returned to the self-study committee for revision. The document will only be distributed to the provost after the dean and the program agree that the document is satisfactory.

Phase III: The Site Visit and Site Visit Report

A.   **Academic External Reviewer's Site Visit**
     Site visits will be conducted during the spring term of the review year.   During a one to two day site visit, normally in April, the external academic reviewers will analyze the program review document, collect additional relevant information, meet with appropriate faculty, administrators, students, and alumni and prepare a report identifying program strengths, concerns and recommendations.

B. **Site Visit Report**   Once site visits are complete, site visitors will be asked to submit a Site Visit Report within three weeks of their visit. This report is sent to the dean.

Phase III. Unit's Response Report and Wrap-Up Session

A. **Unit's Response Report to the Site Visit Report** Once the dean and the program have agreed that the document is satisfactory, it will be shared with the all units affected by that support unit and the Office of the Provost. The program director should review and discuss the report with the faculty and/or staff associated with the program and solicit responses from the directors of those areas affected by the program.

B. **The Self-Study Document**
The following outline is suggested for the self-study document. The narrative should be written easily within twenty pages. (This does not include the director's explanation of workload distribution and appendices.) Selected college/university data summaries are provided and other key college/university documents (e.g., mission statement, strategic plan) are available from the A&S website. The document report should be organized around the following headings:

I. Brief History of the Program

Provide a brief overview of the history of the program including such things as changes in administrative organization; dates new programs were established; significant additions to the staff and major changes in program directions.

II. Findings and Recommendations of the Previous Program Review

Specify the date and type of previous program review. Briefly outline the major findings and recommendations of the previous review and the unit's, colleges,

and/or university's responses to them including actions taken as a result of the recommendations. Briefly outline the impact of changes made as a result of the previous review.

III. Description of the Program

Please organize the report utilizing the headings below. The text within each heading can be modified to better meet unit needs/dimensions.

1. **Mission and Goals**

Describe the mission of the program and its relation to the mission of the college and the university.

Describe the goals of the program and the role of faculty and staff in setting these goals.

Describe the process for assessing the extent to which goals are met.

Evaluate the contribution of the program in advancing the state of the college's or the university's goals.

2. **Program Effectiveness**

Describe the critical elements of the program.

State how the program supports the learning mission of the college's and /or university's academic programs.

Describe the direct measures used to assess outcomes (e.g., number of students served, awards, publications).

Describe other measures of effectiveness (e.g., student satisfaction, institutional surveys).

Discuss ways that the assessment data have been used to enhance the program.

3. **Resource Utilization**

- Evaluate the availability of physical resources (e.g., support resources, equipment, offices) to meet the program's priorities and build strengths.

4. **Future Plans**

Based on the results of the self-study, discuss the program's strategic plans within existing resources?

Should limited additional resources become available, specify programmatic initiatives the program would like to pursue.   Discussion should outline plans in growth areas and resource allocation/reallocation for the next 5 years.