

---

# Graduate Program Review Handbook

---

July 2012

---

University of Guam  
Academic and Student Affairs

---

The University of Guam is committed to high quality academic programs that serve its mission and meet or surpass accreditation standards. The University of Guam requires a regular academic quality review of all graduate programs conducted on a five-year cycle.

## **Commitment to Assessment**

The University of Guam is committed to the assessment of all the academic, administrative and co-curricular services, which it provides for its stakeholders. Assessment denotes the continuous collection of data concerning the effectiveness of services in achieving their stated short-term and long-term goals. This commitment to assessment also applies to research, outreach projects and auxiliary services. The University accepts the responsibility for clarifying and communicating the University's goals and for using its resources to enable stakeholders to achieve their goals. When assessment reveals that goals are not being met or are no longer meeting stakeholders' needs with reasonable success, improvements will be made in the way the University prioritizes and provides those services so as to increase to acceptable levels their effectiveness and value to its stakeholders.

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: Graduate Program Review Executive Summary (GPR-Exec).....	2
Section II: Graduate Program Self-Study Guidelines (GPSSG) .....	6
Section III: Graduate Program Review – Administrative Procedures (GPR-AP) .....	11
Section IV: Transmittal Form and Program Review Checklist .....	17

## Section I: Graduate Program Review Executive Summary

### Academic Program Reviews (Graduate)

Effective Date: August 15, 2005 *(rev July 2012)*

#### 1. The Self-Study

University regulations require that every academic major program be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. For this review each major program prepares a self-study of the curriculum, student outcomes, and supporting areas and resources such as the library, facilities, faculty resources, enrollment management resources, and budget. These self-studies are to conform to a common format and utilize data for program planning and evaluation supplied by the registrar's office or the Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research.

The self-study is reviewed at two levels, the College or School ("College") level and the University level before being forwarded to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs for final approval.

Programs preparing for a program review that have had a recent (within two years) national accreditation review may be permitted to use all or parts of the accreditation self-study for the University program review. If all areas of the self-study are covered by the professional accreditation review, the faculty should attach the University requirements listed in the Graduate Program Self-Study Outline to the professional accreditation review with a table of contents indicating where each requirement is addressed. A cover letter should also be included with information about the timeline for the next review and a copy of the letter conferring professional accreditation. In such cases, the external review requirement may be waived by the Dean.

#### 2. The Program Review Team

After review at the College level by the faculty, the College Academic Affairs Committee (or Curricular Committee) and the Dean, the self-study with transmittal form appropriately signed and all recommendations attached, shall be forwarded to the Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC).

The GCRC will appoint a program review team (PRT), consisting of three full-time members of the graduate faculty of the University of Guam and an external reviewer.

The PRT Chair shall be a member of GCRC. A second reader shall be appointed by and from GCRC. The Faculty Senate shall appoint a third member. The fourth member of the team is an external reviewer nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean. This external reviewer must be chosen from a U.S.A. regionally accredited

university and be a tenured faculty member in the same academic discipline as that under review. The external reviewer is not expected to attend meetings of the committee but will review the self-study and provide his/her evaluative comments to the Dean and the chair of the committee. The Dean in consultation with the Program Faculty under review will provide a set of questions to assist in framing the reviewer's input.

### **3. Program Review Procedures**

The Program Review Team examines the program's self-study and other relevant materials, gathering additional information including the comments of the external member. The Team prepares, originally in draft form and then in final form, a report reflecting both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the major program. The review shall include an evaluation of the program's advising processes and how the current self-study has addressed recommendations from previous self-studies.

The Chair of the Program Review Team is responsible for the preparation, submission and interpretation of review reports, including minority findings. It is the responsibility of the chair to confer with team members and share the contents of the report with team members, program faculty, and the Dean prior to final editing and subsequent submission to the Faculty Senate. The draft report containing recommendations is forwarded to the Dean and the program faculty. The team allows the faculty and Dean two weeks to respond to the report, correct inaccuracies in fact or data, and take reasoned exception to judgment or conclusions drawn. All such input shall be appended to the self-study.

After endorsement by the Senate, the report, all responses, and final recommendations are forwarded by the Senate President to the Senior Vice President (SVP) for action.

### **4. Final Response to Program Review**

The normal time period to be covered by a program undergoing review is five years. A number of circumstances may lead to approval for a reduced length of time. Some of these circumstances may be related to the quality of the program, but not all circumstances are related to quality. A formal set of recommendations from the Faculty Senate includes one of the following:

- 1) Recommendation for approval for five years with specific dates listed; or
- 2) Recommended approval for a period of less than five years, subject to the fulfillment of specified conditions. (The report must specify the actions required to allow full approval); or

- 3) Recommended phasing out or consolidating the program; and
- 4) Any other recommendations

### **Reasons for Less than Five-Year Approval**

Under some circumstances, a situation may evolve sufficiently rapidly to raise concerns about the wisdom of approving a program for the full five years. Such concerns do not necessarily reflect a negative view of the quality of the program, but the team may consider that it is important to monitor the situation. Some examples of such situations are:

- 1) Declining enrollment (*Too many options for too few students? Repeated low enrollment in some classes? Is the program still viable?*)
- 2) Inability to retain adequate faculty. (*Reevaluate mission and goals before new hiring? Can the current faculty adequately staff the program?*)
- 3) External changes. (*Are they no longer current or needed? Have there been significant new developments in the discipline? Is there a lack of response to previous recommendations?*)
- 4) Advisement. (*Students are not advised and are experiencing difficulty towards the end of their program? Are there advisement procedures? Is there a lack of student satisfaction with advisors?*)
- 5) Assessment. (*Are the Assessment plan or learning outcomes inadequate? Plan in place but no implementation of recommendations?*)

Problems identified by the Program Review Team may also include some of the following areas:

- 1) Course syllabi which reflect a lack of rigor (e.g. currency in course material, simplistic exams, inappropriate grading methods, inadequate research and writing requirements).
- 2) Course syllabi and materials that do not require the quantity and quality of student work typically expected by normal practices in the academy.
- 3) Lack of clarity or agreement among the faculty of the program with respect to departmental goals and objectives, including student learning outcomes.

- 4) A structure to the graduate program which is inconsistent with similar major programs at other institutions or inconsistent with typical practices, unless justified.
- 5) A loss of or change in professional or specialized accreditation.

*(This list is not exhaustive.)*

## **5. Self-Study Guidelines, Components, and Evaluative Criteria**

Section II includes the Graduate Program Self-study Guidelines (GPSSG) as recommended by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Office of the Senior Vice President.

## **6. Self-Study Administrative Procedures.** Section III includes the Graduate Program Review Administrative Procedures (GPR-AP)

## **7. Transmittal Forms and Program Review Checklist.** The transmittal form and Program Review Checklist are found in Section IV.

## Section II: Graduate Program Self-Study Guidelines (GPSSG)

### University of Guam Graduate Self-Study Outline

Each University of Guam graduate program must consult these guidelines when preparing the program's self-study document. Program reviews must be completed every five (5) years after the initial review, with deadline for the subsequent reviews specified in the SVP's letter to the program faculty at the conclusion of each cycle. All reviews must include an external peer review.

The program self-study narrative should be **no longer than twenty (20) pages**, excluding appendices. The self-study's body, which will remain light on narrative description, should primarily address the program's faculty, curriculum, student-learning outcomes, and resources (as specified in the sections below). Should program faculty members feel the need to add further narrative detail during the review process, they may do so in Section 7 (Future Plans, Budget Implications, and Recommendations), but should limit such detail to no more than five (5) additional pages. Before beginning the review process, the program's faculty (or the self-study coordinator) must meet with the program's Dean (or appropriate administrator) to agree upon a plan for completing the self-study that includes specific benchmarks and deadlines, approved in writing by the Dean, sufficient to ensure submission within the published deadline.

### Outline of the Self-study

Each self-study narrative shall comprise the following sections. Please note that Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 require supporting evidence for the quality criteria specified in the Graduate Program Performance Goals (found on Pages 2-4):

- 1) Introduction and Program Mission: This brief introductory section (3-5 paragraphs) should address the program's success in implementing the goals and recommendations identified by the previous program review. This section should also set the context for the self-study's evidence, analysis, and recommendations;
- 2) Faculty: This section should address quality criteria and supporting evidence pertaining to faculty credentials, preparation, and scholarship. See "Section 2: Faculty" (below) for specific details;
- 3) Program Curriculum: This section should address quality criteria and supporting evidence pertaining to the program's curricular design, course offerings, pedagogical rigor, and minimum standards. See "Section 3: Program Curriculum" (below) for specific details;

- 4) Student Learning Outcomes and Experiences: This section should address quality criteria and supporting evidence pertaining to the program's course rotation, graduate-student mentoring, thesis advisement, and recruitment. This section should strive to answer two primary questions: 1) What does the program expect its graduate students to articulate, demonstrate, create, and/or present upon completing their course of study? and 2) How are these outcomes assessed? See "Section 4: Student Learning Outcomes and Experiences" (below) for specific details;
- 5) Resources: This section should address quality criteria and supporting evidence pertaining to the program's financial support of graduate students, library resources, and facilities. See "Section 5: Resources" (below) for specific details.
- 6) External Review: This section should include the program's external review along with the external examiner's full name, title, and institutional affiliation(s);
- 7) Future Plans and Budget Implications, and Recommendations: This section should address the program's progress and lack of progress in all areas, including (but not limited to) graduate-student recruitment, plans, assessment plans, program-revision plans, and hiring new faculty members. This section should also include specific, bulleted recommendations that the program plans to pursue during the next five-year review period.

## Graduate Program Performance Goals

During the self-study review process, each program must conduct a self-assessment by using qualitative and quantitative data to determine the program’s overall performance. Quality criteria and supporting evidence for Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 appear below. Sections 1, 6, and 7 have different requirements (please see Outline of the Graduate Program Self-Study for details):

Quality Criteria	Supporting Evidence
<p><b>Section 2: Faculty</b></p> <p>(a) The program's faculty members will reflect a diverse mix of experiences, expertise, and scholarship that underline the diverse knowledge that the program intends to offer students;</p> <p>(b) Graduate faculty members will demonstrate continuing involvement in scholarship, professional activities, publications, and creative research related to their fields of specialty;</p> <p>(c) The program will maintain a sufficient number of full-time graduate faculty members, as required by WASC, to teach core courses in its curriculum, with specified limits, rationales, and assignments for part -time faculty.</p>	<p><b>Section 2: Faculty</b></p> <p>(a) Annually updated faculty curriculum roster and vitae for all full-time and part-time faculty members;</p> <p>(b) Evidence of current, discipline-relevant publications, professional activity, ongoing research, and creative activities;</p> <p>(c) Trend data such as: credit-hour production, the number of graduates per year, full-time and part-time faculty teaching loads, course enrollments, and (for every semester) the number and teaching assignments of part-time faculty members.</p>
<p><b>Section 3: Program Curriculum</b></p> <p>(a) Graduate programs will include well-designed courses offered only to graduate students;</p> <p>(b) The program's curriculum and pedagogy will facilitate open debate and innovation. Furthermore, programs will seek to align course, program, and University learning objectives. Wherever possible, the program will implement these qualities into professional/internship experiences. Pedagogical practice</p>	<p><b>Section 3: Program Curriculum</b></p> <p>(a) For courses available to both undergraduate and graduate students, graduate syllabi and student-learning outcomes must reflect graduate-level standards;</p> <p>(b) Syllabi, student evaluations, and learning objectives;</p>

Quality Criteria	Supporting Evidence
<p>will encourage ethical reflection and interactions between students and faculty members;</p> <p>(c) Minimum standards should include the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conformity to program and course-learning objectives and outcomes;</li> <li>2. Compliance with human- and animal-research regulations;</li> <li>3. Field research and public service, depending upon discipline, whenever possible;</li> </ol> <p>(d) Graduate theses and special projects will consistently reflect the program's intended knowledge, outcomes, and abilities.</p>	<p>(c) Course syllabi and outlines, student-research projects and experiences (including theses and special projects), alumni surveys, and documented human- and animal-research compliance;</p> <p>(d) Programs should establish rubrics for assessing thesis quality. Non-thesis options must likewise meet rigorous assessment standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 4: Student Outcomes and Experiences</b></p> <p>(a) The program will offer graduate courses on a regularly scheduled basis;</p> <p>(b) Program curricula, graduate-student mentoring, thesis advisement, and program resources will prepare students to become successful researchers/professionals;</p>	<p><b>Section 4: Student Outcomes and Experiences</b></p> <p>(a) Archived copies of all semester schedules;</p> <p>(b) Graduate Bulletin course and faculty listings, student reports about research/internship experiences, learning-objective assessments and outcomes, data demonstrating the evidence of graduate students and program graduates during the review period, and clear evidence of “Closing the loop”: of changes in the curriculum and/or in pedagogy that are based on the results of analyzed data from assessments of student learning outcomes; include in an appendix copies of all annual assessment inventories completed by the program during the period under review, along with the dean or director's written evaluative comments on each assessment inventory; provide details of the</p>

Quality Criteria	Supporting Evidence
<p>(c) Criteria for recruiting students will emphasize both scholarly ability and diversity of experience and background;</p> <p>(d) Graduate programs will not only try to place their graduates in suitable employment, but also assess their results with alumni surveys.</p>	<p>assessment process that tracks student learning outcomes from admission to graduation. Refer to the WASC rubrics, “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews”, and “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes” available online at <a href="http://www.wascsenior.org/">www.wascsenior.org/</a></p> <p>(c) The program will regularly archive and analyze graduate-student background information and academic performance;</p> <p>(d) Alumni surveys and other appropriate assessment instruments.</p>
<p><b>Section 5: Resources</b></p> <p>(a) The University, the UOG Endowment Foundation, and the program itself, whenever possible, will provide students with financial support to maintain progress in their studies;</p> <p>(b) Library resources and services, along with appropriate in-program materials and equipment, will directly support the program's student-learning objectives and curriculum;</p> <p>(c) Building facilities and learning environments will easily support and enhance each graduate student's learning experiences and progress;</p> <p>(d) Online resources (including wireless-network capability) should be readily accessible and reliable.</p>	<p><b>Section 5: Resources</b></p> <p>(a) Data from the University's Financial Aid Office and evidence of student support through program-related research grants and student assistantship programs;</p> <p>(b) Information about library resources and support should not only identify strengths and weaknesses, but also reflect evidence of communication between the program's faculty members and the library's support staff;</p> <p>(c) The results of standardized, regular, and independent evaluations of the program's buildings and facilities will accurately reflect available resources;</p> <p>(d) Computer Center statistics, Distance Education Unit statistics, and program statistics pertaining to available computer equipment and wireless access.</p>

## Section III: Graduate Program Review Administrative Procedures (GPR-AP) August 2005 *(rev Jun 2012)*

### **1. Preamble**

The University of Guam is committed to high quality academic programs that serve its mission and meet or surpass accreditation standards. The University of Guam requires a regular academic quality review of all graduate programs. Graduate program reviews, conducted on a five-year cycle, reflect and support the mission of the University of Guam.

### **2. Definitions of Academic Programs**

#### **2.1. Academic Degree Program (Graduate)**

An academic degree program at the graduate level is a structured grouping of course work and educational experiences designed to meet an educational objective and defined learning outcomes, consistent with the mission of the University of Guam, which upon completion, results in a post-baccalaureate degree. All graduate programs have as their academic home one of colleges or schools: the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the College of Natural and Applied Sciences, the School of Business and Public Administration, and the School of Education.

### **3. Purpose of Graduate Program Review**

The primary purposes of program review at the University of Guam are to assess whether learning outcomes are being achieved and to enhance the quality of the graduate academic programs. The review elucidates the contributions of a program toward the achievement of the mission of the University of Guam and ensures that all programs meet the standards set by the Board of Regents, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, United States Land Grant Institutions, and by program-selected professional accrediting bodies, as available and appropriate.

In recognition of these accrediting standards, the program review process serves the purpose of ensuring continuous growth while benchmarking academic programs of the University of Guam with similar programs from other universities. The process and outcomes of all program reviews are structured to encourage faculty, student, and program development, thus guiding overall programmatic improvements.

Therefore, all information gathered, analyzed, and interpreted during the review process should inform faculty and facilitate administrative data-based decisions regarding student learning outcomes and such diverse yet related issues as program refinement and resource allocation. The review process provides the necessary documentation to assure our region's present and prospective stakeholders of academic program quality and prudent stewardship of public resources. In addition, organizational learning occurs when the institution reflects on progress made toward goals and thinks strategically about future goals.

## **4. Roles and Responsibilities**

### **4.1. Program Faculty**

All faculty members of graduate programs have student outcome assessment and evaluation of program goals and objectives an integral part of their programs. The faculty work collectively to implement decisions and recommendations of the most recent program review and, in consultation with the administration and the Dean, plan and conduct the self-study for the next scheduled program review.

### **4.2. Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research**

The Assessment Coordinator uses the resources of the Computer Center and units responsible for providing information (such as the Registrar's office and HRO) to assist the program faculty in generating program-specific and institutional data necessary to write the self-study. The Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research provides reports at the end of each semester summarizing credit hour production and listing all declared majors.

### **4.3. Chair/Program Administrator**

The Division Chair or Associate Dean responsible for each program ensures that program faculty members clearly understand the schedule of program reviews and provides opportunities for faculty development pertaining to the development of student learning outcomes, assessment of student learning outcomes and program evaluation. The administration works collaboratively with the program faculty during the process of writing the self-study and analyzing data.

### **4.4. College Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)**

Program faculty members submit their self-study to the Academic Affairs Committee or Curriculum Committee of the appropriate school or college for review and approval. Members of the AAC examine particular questions, such as the following:

- Does the format and substance of the self-study meet the graduate program review guidelines?
- Do the program faculty members adequately describe the program and the learning outcomes required for graduation?
- Does the self-study adequately support the University and college mission as well as any existing academic, financial, and physical master plans of the College?
- Are enrollment and graduation trends appropriate for the type and level of degree awarded?
- Does the self-study provide evidence of academic quality?

The chair of the AAC signs the Program Review Transmittal form, attaches AAC recommendations and forwards it to the Dean of the College, with a copy to the program coordinator.

#### 4.5. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library

The faculty of the RFK Memorial Library, in collaboration with the Assessment Coordinator, develops and maintains a resource and reference desk pertaining to student learning assessment and academic program review.

During the review process, copies of the self-study (or one copy, if the self-study is provided in electronic media format) are kept on reserve at the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library. After the program review process is complete, one copy remains in the office of the Senior Vice President, and two copies (or one copy, if the self-study is provided in electronic media format) remain in the RFK Library as reference for future reviews of the academic program.

#### 4.6. College Dean

After the AAC has approved the self-study, the Dean:

- a) completes the college evaluation of the self-study, formulates recommendations and reports his/her findings to the GCRC and signs the Program Review Transmittal Form to the GCRC and program coordinator.
- b) Sends a copy of the self-study to the external reviewer, including a list of evaluative questions for reviewer response
- c) Places two copies of the self-study (or one copy, if the self-study is provided in electronic media format) in the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library at the reserve desk for review by members of the GCRC, the Faculty Senate, and the general public
- d) Forwards two copies of the self-study (or one copy, if the self-study is provided in electronic media format) to the Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC).

After the program review cycle is completed, the Dean ensures the program review decisions are implemented in consultation with the faculty of the program. The Dean works closely with the Assistant Vice President for Graduate Studies in preparing the review and response.

#### 4.7. Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC)

Before the due date of the self-study, the Chair of the GCRC, in collaboration with the members of GCRC convenes an ad hoc Program Review Team (PRT) consisting of three full-time graduate faculty members; one selected by and from the GCRC (who will chair the Team), one selected by the GCRC and one member selected by the Faculty Senate. An external reviewer, nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean will provide written input to the PRT. At the beginning of each academic year, the GCRC will send a request to the Senate for faculty members to be named for each review team for that year. The GCRC is also available for consultation and advice to the Program Review Team if the chair so requests. During the review process, two copies (or one copy, if the self-study is provided in

electronic media format) of the self-study of the program are available at the RFK Memorial Library for review.

#### 4.8. Faculty Senate

Before the due date of the self-study of a graduate degree program, the members of the Faculty Senate identify one member of the University of Guam full-time graduate faculty to be a member of the Program Review Team for the review of a specific graduate program. Members of the Faculty Senate are invited to review the self-study of the program and bring comments to the attention of any Program Review Team member.

#### 4.9. Program Review Team (PRT)

Members of the Program Review Team review the self-study of the program, the evaluative comments of the external reviewer, and the recommendations of the AAC and the Dean and make recommendations to the SVP for endorsement by the Senate.

The PRT has three members and, normally, one external reviewer provides input:

- 1) The chair is selected by the Graduate Curricula Review Committee from among the GCRC members. The representative from the program under review may not chair the PRT for his/her program. The chair facilitates the review process and writes the final report. Before the report is submitted to the Senate for endorsement to the SVP, the chair provides an opportunity for the faculty of the program and the Dean to read the report and correct possible factual errors.
- 2) The second member of the Program Review Team is selected by the GCRC from among all full-time graduate faculty.
- 3) The third member of the Program Review Team is selected by the Faculty Senate from among the graduate faculty.
- 4) The external reviewer for each program is nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean. This member should be a tenured faculty member from another U.S.A. regionally accredited University in the same academic discipline as the program under review. This reviewer is not required to attend meetings of the committee but only to read the self-study and provide his/her evaluative comments to the chair of the committee, in response to a set of questions provided by the Dean and program.

#### 4.10. University Assessment Committee (UAC)

The University Assessment Committee oversees the development of policies and procedures for institutional assessment. It discharges this function in close consultation with the various stakeholders involved: the Vice Presidents, Deans, Staff Council, Student Government Association, the Faculty Senate, and all others involved in providing a quality learning experience. Members of the UAC do not directly participate in the review of individual programs.

#### 4.11. Director for Academic Assessment and Institutional Research

The Director for Academic Assessment and Institutional Research (Assessment Coordinator) ensures that the calendar for program reviews is regularly updated and published on campus. The Assessment Coordinator also keeps the general University of Guam community informed about the progress and outcome of program reviews. When programs are in the process of completing their self-studies, the Assessment Coordinator may facilitate the establishment of the Program Review Teams and monitors the program review process and provides assistance to any party involved whenever the process requires it. However, the Assessment Coordinator does not directly review individual programs.

#### 4.12. Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (SVP)

The SVP reviews all documents and recommendations generated during the program review process and makes the final decision on the program under review. The SVP completes the review process by signing the transmittal form and forwarding a letter to the College Dean and faculty of the program outlining these final decisions and specifying the date for the next review. A copy of the letter will also be provided to the Assistant Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Sponsored Programs.

#### 4.13. Program Stakeholder Groups

Members of stakeholder groups of the program participate on two levels. First, the self-study of the program requires documentation of program evaluations by stakeholder groups, the most obvious group being students. Second, members of stakeholder groups may read the self-study placed for review at RFK Memorial Library and may direct their comments to the chair of the Program Review Team.

### **5. Timing**

In general, graduate programs are reviewed every five years. However, the SVP may revise the due dates for program reviews in collaboration with the Dean and faculty of a program based on a request from the faculty via the Dean, in line with specialized accreditation review timetables or for other reasons. The Assessment Coordinator updates, maintains, and announces via the website the schedule of due dates during the fall semester of each academic year.

## 6. Action Sequence and Timing

Action	Persons in Charge	Time
<p><b>Implementation of decisions and recommendations:</b>            Program Faculty and Administrators implement the decisions and recommendations of the previous program review.</p>	Program Faculty and administrators	5 years
<p><u>Establish Program Review Team:</u>            Before the due date of the self-study, the Chair and members of this committee are selected and provided with the guidelines to conduct the review of the self-study.</p>	Assessment Coordinator, Faculty Senate, GCRC, Program Faculty	1 semester
<p><u>Submit self-study to College Academic Affairs Committee:</u>            Program faculty send self-study to AAC for review and approval.            The self-study must be ready for review by the AAC no later than the due date of the self-study</p>	Program Faculty, AAC	Due date of self-study
<p>Submit self-study to External Reviewer and provide a timeline for return of documents and review (one month, normally)</p>	Dean	As soon as the review is prepared.
<p><u>Forward AAC approved self-study:</u>            The Division Chair forwards self-study with AAC recommendations to the Dean, members of Program Review Team, and to JFK Memorial Library</p>	Division Chair	Within 5 working days after AAC approval
<p><u>Review and Provide Recommendations:</u>            The Dean reviews the self-study with recommendations made by AAC and Division Chair and forwards her/his report and recommendations to the chair of the Program Review Team.</p>	Dean	Within 2 months after AAC approval
<p><u>Review and Provide Recommendations:</u>            The Program Review Team reviews the self-study, including recommendations made by the Dean, and submits recommendations to SVP. A copy of the report is also sent to all members of GCRC and Faculty Senate</p>	Program Review Team	
<p><u>Decisions and implementation:</u>            The SVP reviews all recommendations and information generated during the Program review process and formulates decisions in a letter to the faculty of the program and the Dean for implementation.</p>	SVP	Within 2 months after receipt of reports



## PROGRAM REVIEW CHECKLIST

After submission, the Graduate Curricula Review Committee (GCRC) will conduct a preliminary review using the following checklist. Incomplete self-studies will be returned to the program chair with a request to provide missing items.

A complete program review should contain the following items. Indicate  for completed items.

PROGRAM NAME:

DATE RECEIVED:

- Dean/Director Letter of Transmittal to the Faculty Senate President
- Five (5) Complete Sets of Binders (or two (2) Complete sets of Binders and Digital-Media Equivalents) Containing Program Documents

### Documents List

- Cover Sheet with Program Name, College/School, Review Period (i.e., 2005-2010), Program Name, and Complete Contact Information for Program Chair or Self-Study Coordinator
- Section 1: Introduction and Program Mission:** Please include the completed program review form with all Dean and AAC signatures/dates, plus a 3- to 5-paragraph program description;
- Section 2: Faculty:** Updated faculty vitae (for all full-time and part-time faculty members); evidence of faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity; and other evidence;
- Section 3: Program Curriculum:** Course syllabi and outlines, student-learning objectives, and other supporting evidence;
- Section 4: Student-Learning Outcomes and Experiences:** Semester schedules; Graduate Bulletin course and faculty listings; alumni surveys; and program data tables, charts, graphs, and text (where appropriate). The program should demonstrate the number of enrolled graduate students and the number of program graduates during the review period;
- Section 5: Resources:** Evidence of graduate-student financial support, as well as data about financial, library, computer, and online resources;
- Section 6: External Review:** The external examiner's report, along with the examiner's name, title, and institutional affiliation(s). *(For programs holding specialized accreditation, the accreditation report may serve as the external review.)*
- Section 7: Future Plans, Budget Implications, and Recommendations:** Please use bullet points to summarize the program's recommendations for the next five years.
- Section 8: GCRC Report:** Leave a divider or space for the GCRC report.

Reviewers:

Review Date:

(Note: GCRC will not review any program until Sections 1-7 are complete.)



## PROGRAM REVIEW

### Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Required Elements of the Self-Study	Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes.	Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings.	Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.	Faculty are required to evaluate the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, bench-marking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.
Process of Review	Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades.	Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.	Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts; departments use the feedback to improve their work.	Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning.
Planning and Budgeting	The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes.	The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success.	The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process.	The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.
Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts	No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc.	An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.	A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.	A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support
The Student Experience	Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review.	Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys	The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it.	Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback.

## **How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Program Review Rubric**

Conclusions should be based on a review of program-review documents and discussion with relevant campus representatives, such as department chairs, deans, and program review committees.

### ***The rubric has five major dimensions:***

1. **Self-Study Requirements.** The campus should have explicit requirements for the program's self-study, including an analysis of the program's learning outcomes and a review of the annual assessment studies conducted since the last program review. Faculty preparing the self-study should reflect on the accumulating results and their impact; and they should plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. As much as possible, programs should benchmark findings against similar programs on other campuses. Questions: Does the campus require self-studies that include an analysis of the program's learning outcomes, assessment studies, assessment results, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, including the impact of changes made in response to earlier studies? Does the campus require an updated assessment plan for the subsequent years before the next program review?
2. **Self-Study Review.** Internal reviewers (on-campus individuals, such as deans and program review committee members) and external reviewers (off-campus individuals, usually disciplinary experts) should evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact; and they should provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. Questions: Who reviews the self-studies? Do they have the training or expertise to provide effective feedback? Do they routinely evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do they provide suggestions for improvement? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?
3. **Planning and Budgeting.** Program reviews should not be *pro forma* exercises; they should be tied to planning and budgeting processes, with expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates. Questions. Does the campus systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes? Are expectations established for the impact of planned changes?
4. **Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts.** Campuses moving into the culture of evidence often find considerable variation in the quality of assessment efforts across programs, and waiting for years to provide feedback to improve the assessment process is unlikely to lead to effective campus practices. While program reviews encourage departments to reflect on multi-year assessment results, some programs are likely to require more immediate feedback, usually based on a required, annual assessment report. This feedback might be provided by an Assessment Director or Committee, relevant Dean or Associate Dean, or others; and whoever has this responsibility should have the expertise to provide quality feedback. Questions: Does someone have the responsibility for providing annual feedback on the assessment process? Does this person or team have the expertise to provide effective feedback? Does this person or team routinely provide feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?
5. **The Student Experience.** Students have a unique perspective on a given program of study: they know better than anyone what it means to go through it as a student. Program review should take advantage of that perspective and build it into the review. Questions: Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review? Are they involved in preparations and the self-study? Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback?



## PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

### Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Comprehensive List	The list of outcomes is problematic: e.g., very incomplete, overly detailed, inappropriate, disorganized. It may include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring relevant institution-wide learning. The list may confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems).	The list includes reasonable outcomes but does not specify expectations for the program as a whole. Relevant institution-wide learning outcomes and/or national disciplinary standards may be ignored. Distinctions between expectations for undergraduate and graduate programs may be unclear.	The list is a well-organized set of reasonable outcomes that focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. It includes relevant institution-wide outcomes (e.g., communication or critical thinking skills). Outcomes are appropriate for the level (undergraduate vs. graduate); national disciplinary standards have been considered.	The list is reasonable, appropriate, and comprehensive, with clear distinctions between undergraduate and graduate expectations, if applicable. National disciplinary standards have been considered. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria for assessing students' level of mastery of each outcome.
Assessable Outcomes	Outcome statements do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. Statements such as "Students understand scientific method" do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.	Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.	Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., "Graduates can write reports in APA style" or "Graduates can make original contributions to biological knowledge."	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, such as rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome.
Alignment	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.	Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum.	The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design may be summarized in a curriculum map.	Pedagogy, grading, the curriculum, relevant student support services, and co-curriculum are explicitly and intentionally aligned with each outcome. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.
Assessment Planning	There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.	The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in the current year.	The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.	The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.
The Student Experience	Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program. Communication of outcomes to students, e.g. in syllabi or catalog, is spotty or nonexistent.	Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors.	Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web page, and elsewhere.	Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes and may participate in creation and use of rubrics. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcomes and levels of performance. Program policy calls for inclusion of outcomes in all course syllabi, and they are readily available in other program documents.

### **How Visiting Team Members Can Use the Learning Outcomes Rubric**

Conclusions should be based on a review of learning outcomes and assessment plans. Although you can make some preliminary judgments about alignment based on examining the curriculum or a curriculum map, you will have to interview key departmental representatives, such as department chairs, faculty, and students, to fully evaluate the alignment of the learning environment with the outcomes.

#### ***The rubric has five major dimensions:***

1. **Comprehensive List.** The set of program learning outcomes should be a short but comprehensive list of the most important knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program, including relevant institution-wide outcomes such as those dealing with communication skills, critical thinking, or information literacy. Faculty generally should expect higher levels of sophistication for graduate programs than for undergraduate programs, and they should consider national disciplinary standards when developing and refining their outcomes, if available. There is no strict rule concerning the optimum number of outcomes, but quality is more important than quantity. Faculty should not confuse learning processes (e.g., completing an internship) with learning outcomes (what is learned in the internship, such as application of theory to real-world practice). Questions. Is the list reasonable, appropriate and well-organized? Are relevant institution-wide outcomes, such as information literacy, included? Are distinctions between undergraduate and graduate outcomes clear? Have national disciplinary standards been considered when developing and refining the outcomes? Are explicit criteria – as defined in a rubric, for example – available for each outcome?
2. **Assessable Outcomes.** Outcome statements should specify what students can do to demonstrate their learning. For example, an outcome might state that “Graduates of our program can collaborate effectively to reach a common goal” or that “Graduates of our program can design research studies to test theories and examine issues relevant to our discipline.” These outcomes are assessable because faculty can observe the quality of collaboration in teams, and they can review the quality of student-created research designs. Criteria for assessing student products or behaviors usually are specified in rubrics, and the department should develop examples of varying levels of student performance (i.e., work that does not meet expectations, meets expectations, and exceeds expectations) to illustrate levels. Questions. Do the outcomes clarify how students can demonstrate learning? Have the faculty agreed on explicit criteria, such as rubrics, for assessing each outcome? Do they have examples of work representing different levels of mastery for each outcome?
3. **Alignment.** Students cannot be held responsible for mastering learning outcomes unless they have participated in a program that systematically supports their development. The curriculum should be explicitly designed to provide opportunities for students to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. This design often is summarized in a curriculum map—a matrix that shows the relationship between courses in the required curriculum and the program’s learning outcomes. Pedagogy and grading should be aligned with outcomes to foster and encourage student growth and to provide students helpful feedback on their development. Since learning occurs within and outside the classroom, relevant student services (e.g., advising and tutoring centers) and co-curriculum (e.g., student clubs and campus events) should be designed to support the outcomes. Questions. Is the curriculum explicitly aligned with the program outcomes? Do faculty select effective pedagogy and use grading to promote learning? Are student support services and the co-curriculum explicitly aligned to promote student development of the learning outcomes?
4. **Assessment Planning.** Faculty should develop explicit plans for assessing each outcome. Programs need not assess every outcome every year, but faculty should have a plan to cycle through the outcomes over a reasonable period of time, such as the period for program review cycles. Questions. Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time? Is the plan sustainable, in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Are assessment plans revised, as needed?
5. **The Student Experience.** At a minimum, students should be aware of the learning outcomes of the program(s) in which they are enrolled; ideally, they should be included as partners in defining and applying the outcomes and the criteria for levels of sophistication. Thus it is essential to communicate learning outcomes to students consistently and meaningfully. Questions: Are the outcomes communicated to students? Do students understand what the outcomes mean and how they can further their own learning? Do students use the outcomes and criteria to self-assess? Do they participate in reviews of outcomes, criteria, curriculum design, or related activities?