

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

The University of Guam is committed to high quality academic programs that are responsive to the needs of our students and our communities, are sustainable for the foreseeable future, serve our mission, and meet or surpass accreditation standards.

The university milieu is constantly changing—the learned disciplines of the faculty, the workforce at the University of Guam, the island’s and region’s needs, and even accreditation requirements change over the course of years, but these changes are becoming more rapid. To grow and improve, we must adapt to these changes and the speed with which they are taking place.

The “Good to Great” (G2G) initiative was successful in its attempt to incorporate data (rather than scholarly rhetoric) and in providing a synchronous evaluation and review of all academic programs, as a “snapshot” in time. In the July 2016 official record of action by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), the reviewers noted that the University of Guam needed to “Examine the academic program review process with an eye to clarifying the purpose, strengthening the impact, simplifying the procedures, creating accountability, ensuring timeliness, removing redundancies, and integrating the priorities from G2G into the review criteria.” This academic program review document represents the guidance for such a revised process.

This revised academic program review will meet the following purposes stipulated in the 2009 *WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*:

- (1) all academic programs and co-curricular programs are subject to systematic program review (WASC CFR [Criteria for Review] 2.7 & 2.11), and
- (2) the program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations (WASC CFR 2.7).

In addition, the 2009 *WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review* notes that program review processes are expected to feature:

- (1) outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development,
- (2) evidence-based claims and decision-making, and
- (3) use of program review results to inform planning and budgeting.

The basic approach for this revised academic program review is similar to that of the G2G initiative—a data-driven, synchronous review of all academic programs (and co-curricular programs) according to pre-determined criteria. The major difference is that only 1 criterion will be examined each year, such that all 5 criteria will be reviewed in a 5-year cycle.

The topics for each of the years are as follows:

- (Year 1) Program Quality,
- (Year 2) Financial Sustainability & Human Resources,
- (Year 3) The Student Experience,
- (Year 4) Program Demand & Relationships, and
- (Year 5) Holistic Review

Refinements or changes to the topics and criteria would be subject to Faculty Senate substantive change review. Refinements to the rubrics are be considered non-substantive changes, as proposed by the AVP for Academic Excellence and approved by the Senior Vice President. Modifications to the timeline must be approved in writing by both the Faculty Senate President and Senior Vice President.

The benefits of this revised academic program review are expected to be:

- (1) this system allows the evaluations of programs to be synchronous, strengthening the impact of the review, creating accountability across the entire university, and ensuring timeliness of submission and evaluation of every program,
- (2) the priorities established with G2G are fully integrated into program review, thereby eliminating redundancy between the university-wide initiatives and program review,
- (3) the University of Guam will be able to adapt and respond to changes in institutional needs and initiatives, as well as changes in higher education, given that the criteria for evaluation for any given year will be able to adapt and respond to these changes,
- (4) the program review report for any one year is significantly shorter than previous reports, allowing more rapid evaluation and feedback, as well as reducing the burden to faculty and programs,
- (5) colleges/schools are able to collectively examine and learn from their most successful programs, deans are provided with the comparative data that will increase their ability to make data-driven decisions with regard to priorities within their college/school, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success will be provided with the comparative data that will increase her/his ability to make data-driven decisions with regard to UOG's priorities,
- (6) feedback via reports and rubric completion on ways to improve and how the program performs with respect to other programs can be provided at both the college-wide and university-wide levels, and
- (7) this system ensures that the innovation and success of the highest-level programs can not only be celebrated across the campus but shared to enhance the quality and currency of all programs at the university.

Submission Process

The program review process is administered by AVP Academic Excellence. In the first week of the semester, the Office of Academic Excellence will open the submission portal within Nuventive *Improve* (formerly known as *TracDat*) with data populated for each program. Programs will then submit their completed program review by the end of the first full week in November.

The process is designed to begin and conclude within an academic year, covering the review period of the five prior academic years. Each year will report on the preceding five years, such that there is a sliding "reporting window." If a program has only been in existence for two years when the process begins, then the first year they will only have two years upon which to report. This will be taken into account as the programs are evaluated with the rubrics. The next year they will have three years upon which to report, and so on. Ultimately, the fifth year will encompass the previous four years of program review to complete the first cycle of program review.

Table 1. Summary Program Submission Timelines for first five-year cycle

	Period of Review	Release of Data	Program Due Date
Program Quality	2015-2020	August 17, 2020	November 6, 2020
Financial Sustainability & Human Resources	2016-2021	August 16, 2021	November 5, 2021
The Student Experience	2017-2022	August 15, 2022	November 4, 2022
Program Demand & Relationships	2018-2023	August 14, 2023	November 10, 2023
Holistic Review	2019-2024	August 12, 2024	November 8, 2024

Page or word lengths will be stipulated in the final instructions, with program data as the only allowable appendices (narrative-free). In addition, the program review document will be submitted in the format provided, without significant change to format, point-size, etc. The focus will be on outcomes, progress, and successes—with some limited space for “bragging” about those successes, plans for growth, and the three greatest issues (and potential solutions) for the program. This may also include paths to improvement for factors beyond the control of the program.

Note that there will be progressive penalties for non-compliance or non-submission which may result in the restriction of funds, such as those for travel, new faculty, etc. Deans will send a memo of warning on the date the AAC review ends. When Dean’s submit their recommendations, they will issue recommendations based on incomplete reports. The Faculty Senate president will issue a list of missing programs to the Senior Vice President when received by the UCRC. The Senior Vice President will issue a memo to the Dean authorizing appropriate penalties.

Review Process

The academic program reviews shall follow the existing curriculum review process at UOG, from the program, through the college or school academic affairs or curriculum committee, through the dean, through the Faculty Senate academic review committees (UCRC/GCRC), culminating in validation by the Faculty Senate, and final approvals and recommendations from the Senior Vice President. Student or alumni representatives are encouraged to comment on program reviews in any committee deliberations.

Table 2. Summary Program Review Process

	Program Due Date	AAC/CC review Due	Dean’s Review Due	UCRC/GCRC review Due	Senate Review	SVP review
Program Quality	November	End of Fanuchanan Semester To provide rubric scores	End of January	March Senate Meeting	April Senate meeting	End of Fanomnakan Semester
Financial Sustainability & Human Resources	November	End of Fanuchanan Semester	End of January to provide rubric scores	March Senate Meeting	April Senate meeting	End of Fanomnakan Semester

The Student Experience	November	End of Fanuchanan Semester	End of January	March Senate Meeting To provide rubric scores	April Senate meeting	End of Fanomnakan Semester
Program Demand & Relationships	November	End of Fanuchanan Semester	End of January	March Senate Meeting To provide rubric scores	April Senate meeting	End of Fanomnakan Semester
Holistic Review	November	End of Fanuchanan Semester	End of January to include external review	March Senate Meeting	April Senate meeting	End of Fanomnakan Semester to provide rubric scores

Each year, programs will be scored by one specific entity in the review chain to evaluate each of the programs in their area according to the Program Review Rubric. A rubric will be used to rate the various elements of each program review submitted. To improve reliability in the review process each year, the AVP Academic Excellence will conduct calibration sessions with the review entities. This will improve inter-rater reliability, fairness in scoring across campus. In keeping with formative assessment practices, programs will be encouraged to self-assess their Program Review reports with the rubrics.

1. *Program Quality.* The colleges or school's Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) or Curriculum Committee (CC) is considered the best group for evaluation of this rubric, because they are familiar with the standards of excellence in their respective fields. According to the boundaries suggested and set by WSCUC, best practices, and the University of Guam's Institutional Learning Outcomes [ILOs], these committees are able to define quality for their school & college, and to evaluate faculty qualifications, program rigor, and goals for each program.

The AAC or will then have until the end of the Fanuchanan Semester to review the submissions of each of the programs in their area. Except in the year the AACs/CCs are responsible for the rubric evaluation, they will check for completion. If omissions are found, the AAC chair and Dean will request the missing information prior to the end of the semester.

2. *Financial Sustainability & Human Resources.* The Deans are considered the best evaluators for this rubric, because they are ultimately responsible for managing the finances and human resources of the programs under their stewardship. Each Dean will provide feedback to each of the programs, with suggestions for improvement and an indication of how the program review will impact the Academic Master Plan of the School or College.

Each Dean will then have until the end of January to provide feedback to each of the programs under her or his purview, with suggestions for improvement and an indication of how the each program's performance will impact the Academic Master Plan of the School or College.

3. *Student Experience.* The appropriate Academic Review Committee (UCRC/GCRC) of the Faculty Senate will then review all submissions and present the combined findings of all the program submissions during the March Faculty Senate Meeting for discussion.

4. *Program Demand & Relationships.* The appropriate Academic Review Committee (UCRC/GCRC) of the Faculty Senate will then review all submissions and present the combined findings of all the program submissions during the March Faculty Senate Meeting for discussion.
5. *Holistic Review.* The Senior Vice President will evaluate programs according to the appropriate rubric, and coordinate with the respective deans to ensure external reviews are complete

Once the Faculty Senate has endorsed the combined findings of program quality from across the university, the Faculty Senate will send the entire package to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Student Success for final approval by the end of the semester. The final results will be publically posted and forwarded to the Deans for conversations with their respective programs.

External Review

The fifth year of program review will require that each Dean compile the results of the previous four years and seek external review by a knowledgeable expert from a regionally accredited US university of the programs in their school or college. This review will provide suggestions for improvement.

If a program receives external accreditation, this external accreditation will serve as the above external review. (Information from external reviews may also be a part of the rubric-based review for Program Quality, The Student Experience, and Program Demand & Relationships: including, but not limited to the data, successes, and inter-relationships of the program.)

For those programs which do not have external accreditation, the Deans may also choose to begin the process of external review in May 2024, after results from all four years have been posted. Once an external reviewer has accepted the task, the Dean may provide the results for years 1–3 to the external reviewer and by mid-February will be able to provide the results for year 4 to the external reviewer. This essentially allows the reviewer over 1 year to complete the review, with the last piece (year 5) available during the last month. For those programs that already receive external accreditation, there is no need for the Dean to seek additional review (the most recent external accreditation will serve as the external review).

Expansion Beyond Academic Programs

For simplicities sake, the Fanuchanan 2020 review cycle will only include review of clearly defined academic programs, those graduate and undergraduate major programs culminating in conferral of an academic degree. This review process will then expand to include co-curricular programs and academic support programs. The AVP Academic Excellence will work with deans and directors to define those units appropriate before the release of data in August. At the end of the first five-year cycle, each of these additional programs will continued to be reviewed in synch with academic programs.

In Fanuchanan 2021, other academic programs will begin the review process, starting with year two, financial resources. This will include academic minor and certificate programs, and other curricular support programs, such as developmental mathematics, critical thinking, and general education, as well as pre-professional programs, such as pre-nursing. This review will also include stand-alone research units, such as ORSP, Marine Lab, WERI, WTPRC, Extension, MARC, and University Libraries.

In Fall 2022, all EMSS units (Admissions & Records, Counseling, Career Development, Student Life, Residence Life, the First Year Seminar, and grant-supported activities, such as TRIO and AmeriCorps) will be included for co-curricular review of the student experience.

The Senior Vice President and Vice President for Administration and Finance will work with the AVP Academic Excellence, the AVP Institutional Effectiveness, the Associate Budget & Planning Officer, and the Chief Planning Officer to create and implement a similar annual review process for all other offices on campus.