SCHEDULE FOR IN-DEPTH PROGRAM REVIEWS

AY	UNIT	**Final Reports are due in May**

2015-2016   Psychology (external review)

2016-2017   Chemistry (accreditation review), English (including MSRP and NOR), History, Languages and Cultures (including the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, the Certificate in Translation and Interpreting, and the Ross Foreign Language Center), Math (including the Math Lab and the Computational Science Interdisciplinary minor), Philosophy, Political Science, Religious Studies (including the Yamauchi Lecture series), Teacher Certification (all internal reviews, except Chemistry)

2017-2018   Biology, Environment Program, Physics (all internal reviews)

2018-2019   Classical Studies, Criminal Justice, Sociology, IQEE, JSRI, Lindy Boggs Center

2019-2020   Interdisciplinary programs: African and African American Studies, American Studies, Asian Studies, Catholic Studies, Film Studies, Legal Studies, Medieval Studies, Middle East Peace Studies, Women's Studies

2020-2021   Psychology (internal review), Mass Communication (accreditation review)

2021-2022   Chemistry (accreditation review), English (including MSRP and NOR), History, Languages and Cultures (including the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, the Certificate in Translation and Interpreting, and the Ross Foreign Language Center), Math (including the Math Lab and the Computational Science Interdisciplinary minor), Philosophy, Political Science, Religious Studies (including the Yamauchi Lecture series), Teacher Certification (all external reviews)

2022-2023   Biology, Environment Program, Physics, (all external reviews)

There will be internal department reviews five years after an external review, to evaluate the progress in responding to the external review. Programs with only a minor will not normally have external reviews.

CAS POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

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.

Program Review Procedures and Self-Study Document

The academic program reviews consist of four phases including the preparatory phase, the development of the self-study document and, if an external review is undertaken, the development of revised action plans based on reviewers' recommendations. At the end of the review process a report is submitted to SCAP including the self-study document, the external evaluators report (if appropriate), and any additional documents that/results.

Phase I.	Preparatory Phase
Phase II.	Self-Study Document: Development and Preparation

Phase III   The Site-Visit and Site Visit Report (not required; recommended every five years)
Phase IV.   Program Report to SCAP

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 that a review will be conducted.

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-study document.

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 document.

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

E. **Nomination of Site Visitors (if an external review will be conducted)**
   Whether or not there is a site visit depends on departmental needs, recommendations from the dean, and available funding. It is recommended that an external site visit occur once every ten years. The unit leader of the program to be reviewed, in consultation with the self-evaluation committee and the unit/program faculty, should submit a list of names and qualifications of potential external academic reviewers with relevant expertise. The dean, in consultation with the unit or program, will select the external academic reviewers from the list of names provided. Each department is expected to follow the external review with an internal review after five years.

Phase II. Self-Study Document: Development and Preparation

A. **Document Preparation**
   The Self-Study Document is an interpretive document that uses data to assess current program status and future directions (see Appendix 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-Study Document, 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 (if a site visit will be conducted)

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 Self-Study 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 IV. Unit's Response Report and Wrap-Up Session (if a site visit was conducted)

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. **Presentation of the Self-Study Document and supporting documentations to SCAP**

Appendix: The Self-Study Document

The Standing Council for Academic Planning approved this Self-Study Document on 02/02/2016.