
Undergraduate Program Review Handbook

August 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 undergraduate programs, conducted on a five-year cycle.

Each major program prepares a self-study of the curriculum, student outcomes, and supporting areas 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.

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. 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.



UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Effective Date: November 1, 2003 (*rev Aug 2012*)

1. The Self Study

University regulations require that every academic major program be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis every five years. For this review each major program prepares a self-study of the curriculum, student outcomes, and supporting areas 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 (SVP) for Academic and Student Affairs for final approval.

Program-Level Professional Accreditation. 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 Undergraduate Program Self-Study Guidelines 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.

External Reviewer. An external reviewer, nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean, examines the program's self-study. 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 Program Review Team 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.

2. The Program Review Team

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

The UCRC will appoint a program review team, consisting of four full-time faculty members. The Chair shall be a member of UCRC. A second reader shall be appointed by and from UCRC. The Faculty Senate shall appoint a third member. The fourth member of the team is an external reviewer as mentioned above.

3. Program Review Team 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 discuss 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 of the Senate, the report, all responses, and final recommendations are forwarded to the Senior Vice President for action.

4. Final Response to Program Review

The normal period of approval for 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) Rapidly increasing enrollment. (Sufficient support? Facilities adequate?)
- 3) Inability to retain adequate faculty. (Reevaluate mission and goals before new hiring? Can the current faculty adequately staff the program?)
- 4) External changes. (No longer current or needed? Significant new developments in the discipline? Lack of response to previous recommendations.)
- 5) Advisement lacking. (Students are not advised and have difficulty in their senior year? No advisement procedures? Lack of student satisfaction with advisors?)
- 6) 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 (*This list is not exhaustive.*):

- 1) Course syllabi which reflect a lack of rigor (e.g. currency in course material, simplistic exams, inappropriate grading methods, inadequate reading and writing requirements)
- 2) Faculty teaching courses for which they are not sufficiently prepared or qualified
- 3) Course syllabi and materials that do not require the quantity and quality of student work typically expected by normal practices in the academy.
- 4) Lack of clarity or agreement among the faculty of the program with respect to departmental goals and objectives, including student learning outcomes.
- 5) A structure to the major which is inconsistent with similar major programs at other institutions or inconsistent with typical practices, unless justified.
- 6) A loss of professional or specialized accreditation.

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

The Undergraduate Program Review Self-study Guidelines are recommended and endorsed by the Faculty Senate, endorsed by the Academic Officers Council, and approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. These guidelines will be used until revised and reissued by the Senior Vice President.

6. Self-Study Administrative Procedures

The administrative procedures provide the definitions, roles, responsibilities and timing of the self-study.

7. Program Review Transmittal Form and UCRC Program Review Checklist.

A transmittal form accompanies the self-study to document the various levels of review and approvals of the self-study. A checklist is used to assist in ensuring that the self-study contains the required information, data, and analysis necessary for a thorough review.

Undergraduate Program Self Study Guidelines *(rev Aug 2012)*

The Dean, in consultation with the program faculty, will meet with the program coordinator of each degree program to clarify the timelines for an initial review. As the University of Guam continues the evaluation of outcomes, the focus will be on student learning and scholarship.

Each University of Guam undergraduate program must consult these guidelines when preparing the program self-study document. It is understood that these reviews will be done every five (5) years after the initial review on a rotating basis, with deadline for the subsequent reviews specified in the SVP letter to the program faculty at the conclusion of each cycle. An expectation is that all reviews will include an external peer review.

University of Guam Undergraduate Self Study Outline

The program self-study narrative should be kept to a maximum of 20 pages. The body of the self-study will be light on narrative description, and primarily address the Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators of the program (Items II and III below). Should the program faculty members feel the need to add further narrative detail as the self-study progresses through the review process, they may do so in Section VI, but they should limit that narrative to an additional five (5) pages. Before beginning the review process the program faculty or the self-study coordinator must meet with the Dean or appropriate administrator to agree on a plan for completion of the self-study with timelines.

Outline of the Self Study

Each self-study will consist of the following sections:

- I. **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.
- II. **Student Learning Outcomes for the Program.** What does the program expect its graduates to articulate, demonstrate, create, and/or present upon completing their course of study, and how are these outcomes assessed? Provide a curriculum map or samples of syllabi that demonstrate how the curriculum provides opportunity for the introduction, reinforcement, and mastery of program level outcomes. Explain what steps have been taken to give students a good grasp of program outcomes. For example, are outcomes included in most syllabi and are readily available in the catalog, on the web, and elsewhere?
- III. **Program Performance Goals and Indicators.** Review and analysis of the key indicators—see table below.
- IV. **Future Plans and Budget Implications.** Program response to lack of progress in certain areas and implementation plans, recruitment plans, implementation of assessment plan, program revision plans, etc.
- V. **External Review.** Include the program's external review along with the external examiner's full name, title, and institutional affiliation(s).
- VI. **Further Information.** Any responses to reports or recommendations at any level may be added to the report by the program faculty via the program coordinator by notifying the PRT Chair. The Chair will then attach the document to the transmittal sheet and send a copy to the Dean.

Undergraduate Program Performance Goals

During the self-study review process, each program will conduct a self-assessment, using qualitative and quantitative data, to determine the overall performance of the program and present this information in Section III of the Self-Study.

Indicators	Guidelines for data-gathering and reflection
<p>1. There is a cadre of faculty who demonstrate currency in their field, sufficient in size to support students in their culminating activity.</p>	<p>How does this discipline define “currency in the field”? Describe the culminating activity and how faculty scholarship specifically supports the activity. List program learning outcomes expected of all students. How does this activity demonstrate the integration of program outcomes? Submit current <i>curriculum vitae</i> for all full-time faculty.</p>
<p>2. Key performance indicators are collected, calculated and analyzed.</p>	<p>Display the following data for the period under review, and briefly analyze what these data mean for the future of the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Number of full and part time faculty b) Number of majors for each year during the period under review. Discuss trends, and the program’s approach to recruiting majors. c) Graduation rate. d) Persistence/retention rate. e) Credit hour production. f) Description of representative placements for program graduates, with data on placements of graduates during the period under review. g) Number of major and elective courses taught in the program. h) Faculty FTE /student FTE ratio i) Results from student learning outcome assessment projects. j) 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 direct 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. k) Subsequent graduate work completed or currently underway by graduates of the program. l) Description of the program's system for academic advisement, and evidence of its effectiveness.

Indicators	Guidelines for data-gathering and reflection
3. There is appropriate physical space, library resources, equipment, and/or materials and supplies to provide support for students.	Evaluate the adequacy of space available, library resources, equipment and/or materials and supplies. Explain program plans to remedy any deficiency.
4. If the program provides students with opportunities for financial support in terms of scholarships, assistantships, and/or internships, please describe them.	What scholarships or programs are in place to support students in this program? What plans are there to increase these programs? Include a summary of internships or capstone activities.
5. There is an assessment process routinely employed that addresses student success in the program as a whole: a process that includes exit interviews, alumni surveys, and a minimum of one outside source of validations (e.g., accreditation, a licensing examination, and advisory committee, or professional degree program placements, or employer surveys). If there are program-specific admission standards, please describe them.	List the program-specific admissions criteria, if any, and how they are applied. Provide details of the 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 www.wascsenior.org/ . If the program's annual assessment inventories (see 2j, above) reference these rubrics, please provide page numbers within the assessment inventory appendix.

Undergraduate Academic Degree Program Review

Administrative Procedures

November 2003 (rev Aug 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 undergraduate programs, conducted on a five-year cycle.

2. Definitions of Academic Programs

2.1. Academic Degree Program

An academic degree program is a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective, consistent with the mission of the University of Guam, which upon completion, results in a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree.

2.2. Academic Minor Program

An academic minor program is a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective, consistent with the mission of the University of Guam, which upon completion, results in a minor, identified on the transcript or a certificate. For the purposes of review, minors that are part of a major will be reviewed with the major.

2.3. Academic Support Program

An academic support program is a structured grouping of course work designed to support a degree program.

3. Purpose of Undergraduate Program Review

The primary purpose of program review at the University of Guam is to assess and strengthen the quality of its academic programs. The assessment elucidates the contributions of programs toward the achievement of the local and regional mission of the University of Guam and ensures that all programs meet the standards set by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, by 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 of other universities. The process and outcome of all program reviews is 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 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

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

4.2. Office of Academic Assessment and Institutional Research

This office 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. This office also provides reports at the end of each semester summarizing credit hour production and the enrollment by academic program.

4.3. Division Chair

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 Division Chair also works collaboratively with the program faculty during the process of writing the self-study and analyzing data.

After the program faculty members have completed the self-study and the Program Coordinator has signed the Program Review Transmittal Form, the Division Chair signs the Program Review Transmittal Form indicating that the unit has reviewed the self-study.

4.4. College Academic Affairs Committee

The College Academic Affairs Committees (AAC) or Curriculum Committees play critical roles in the undergraduate program review. Program faculty members submit their self-study to the AAC of the appropriate school or college for review and approval. Members of the AAC examine the self-study of the undergraduate program with particular questions in mind, such as the following:

- ◇ Does the format and substance of the self-study adhere to the undergraduate program review guidelines?
- ◇ Does the self-study adequately describe the program and learning outcomes required for graduation?
- ◇ Does the self-study adequately reflect the support of 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 and Division Chair.

4.5. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library

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

During the review process of a program, three copies of the self-study are kept on reserve at the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library. After the program review is completed, one copy of the self-study is returned to the undergraduate program, one copy remains in the office of the Senior Vice President, and one copy remains in the RFK Library as reference for future reviews of the academic program.

4.6. Dean

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

- a. completes the college evaluation of the self-study, formulates recommendations, attaches his/her findings to the self-study, signs the Program Review Transmittal Form, and forwards the self-study to the UCRC. A copy of the Dean's recommendations and findings are forwarded to the program coordinator and Division Chair.
- 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 UCRC, 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 UCRC.

After the program review cycle is completed, the Dean ensures the program review decisions are implemented in consultation with the faculty of the program.

4.7. Undergraduate Curricula Review Committee

Members of the Undergraduate Curricula Review Committee (UCRC) play a critical role in the program review process. Before the due date of the self-study of an academic degree program, the Assessment Coordinator in collaboration with the members of UCRC convenes an ad hoc Program Review Team (PRT) consisting of four members; one selected by the faculty of the program under review as an external reviewer, two members selected by the UCRC (one who will chair the Team), and one member selected by the Faculty Senate. At the beginning of each academic year, the UCRC will send a request to the Senate for faculty members to be named for each review team. The UCRC is also available for consultation and advice to the Program Review Team if the chair requests it. During the review process, a copy of the self-study of the program is available at the RFK Memorial Library to all members of UCRC.

4.8. Faculty Senate

Before the due date of the self-study of an academic degree program, the members of the Faculty Senate identify one member of the University of Guam faculty to be a member of the Program Review Team for the review of the academic program. During the review process, a copy of the self-study of the program is available at the RFK Memorial Library to the Faculty Senate. Members of the Faculty Senate may review the self-study of the program and bring the comments to the attention of the Program Review Team member who they selected.

4.9. Program Review Team

Members of the Program Review Team (PRT) review the self-study of the program, the recommendations of the AAC and the Dean and make recommendations to the SVP.

This PRT has four members:

- 1) The chair is selected by the Undergraduate Curricula Review Committee. S/he facilitates the review process and writes the final report. Before the report is submitted to the SVP, the chair provides an opportunity to 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 also selected by UCRC.
- 3) The third member of the Program Review Team is selected by the Faculty Senate.
- 4) The fourth member of the Program Review Committee is nominated by the program faculty and approved by the Dean. This member is a tenured faculty member from another U.S.A. regionally-accredited University and works in the same academic discipline as the program under review. This member 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.

4.10. University Assessment Committee

The roles or functions of the University Assessment Committee (UAC) is to systematize assessment on an institutional level through, among other activities or actions, regularizing deadlines for programs and units to report on plans, reports, and “closing the loop” actions; oversee assessment at all levels at the University of Guam, including General Education; to provide opportunities for training and support of faculty in assessment; to develop and oversee the assessment of University-wide expected student learning outcomes (SLOs) that should be linked to program and course SLOs ; to collaborate in University assessment activities such as program review and make recommendations to the appropriate body; to advise the University on assessment matters.

UAC discharges these functions in close consultation with the various stakeholders involved: the Senior Vice President, 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 program 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. S/he also keeps the general University of Guam community informed about the progress and outcome of program reviews. The Assessment Coordinator 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.

The Assessment Coordinator chairs the University Assessment Committee.

4.12. Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs

The SVP for Academic and Student Affairs reviews all documents and recommendations generated during the program review process and makes the final decisions on the program review. S/he completes the review process by writing a letter to Dean and faculty of the program outlining these final decisions.

4.13. Program Stakeholder Groups

Members of stakeholder groups of the program participate on two levels as well. First, the self-study of the program requires documentation of program evaluations by stakeholder groups. 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 Committee.

5. Timing

In general, undergraduate programs are reviewed every five years. However, the SVP may change the due dates for program reviews in collaboration with the Dean and faculty of a program based on specialized accreditation review timetables. The Assessment Coordinator updates, maintains, and announces the schedule of due dates.

6. Action Sequence and Timing

Action	Persons in Charge	Time
<p><u>Implementation of decisions and recommendations:</u> 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>	Faculty Senate, UCRC, Program Faculty, Assessment Coordinator	1 semester
<p><u>Submit self-study to College Academic Affairs Committee:</u> Program faculty members send the 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><u>Forward AAC approved self-study:</u> The AAC forwards self-study with AAC recommendations to the Dean and copy to the Division Chair and program coordinator.</p>	AAC	Within 5 working days after AAC approval
<p><u>Submit self-study to External Reviewer:</u> The Dean sends the self-study to External Reviewer and provides a set of questions to assist in framing the reviewer's input, as well as a timeline for return of documents and review.</p>	Dean	One month review
<p><u>Review and Provide Recommendations:</u> The Dean reviews the self-study with recommendations made by AAC and the External Reviewer's report and forwards her/his report and recommendations to the UCRC and Faculty Senate President.</p>	Dean	
<p><u>Review and Provide Recommendations:</u> The Program Review Team reviews the self-study, including reports and recommendations made by the Dean, and submits its recommendations to the Dean, Program Faculty, to UCRC and the Faculty Senate.</p>	Program Review Team	Within 2 months after AAC approval
<p><u>Faculty Senate Response:</u> The Faculty Senate submits its response and the self-study to the SVP.</p>	Faculty Senate	
<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 self-study and reports

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULA REVIEW COMMITTEE (UCRC) PROGRAM REVIEW CHECKLIST

After submission, the UCRC will conduct a preliminary review using the following checklist. Incomplete self-studies will be returned to the program coordinator with a request to provide missing items.

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

PROGRAM NAME:

DATE RECEIVED:

- Program Review Transmittal Form** with Program Coordinator, AAC, and Dean signatures/dates
- Dean/Director Letter of Transmittal** to the Faculty Senate President, including recommendations and findings
- Five (5) **Complete Sets of Binders** (-OR- two (2) complete sets of binders and one digital-media equivalent containing all the program review self-study documents)

Document List

- Cover Sheet** with program name, college/school, review period (i.e., Fall 2005-Spring 2010), and complete contact information for program coordinator or self-study coordinator
- Section I: Introduction and Program Mission** 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.
- Section II: Student Learning Outcomes for the Program (PLOs)** What does the program expect its graduates to articulate, demonstrate, create, and/or present upon completing their course of study, and how are these outcomes assessed?
- Section III: Program Performance Goals and Indicators** Refer to pages 4-6 of the Undergraduate Program Review Handbook for content details.
- Section IV: Future Plans and Budget Implications** Program response to lack of progress in certain areas and implementation plans, recruitment plans, implementation of assessment plan, program revision plans, etc.
- Section V: 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 VI: Further Information** Any response to reports or recommendations at any level may be added to the report by the program faculty via the program coordinator by notifying the PRT Chair. The Chair will then attach the document to the transmittal sheet and send a copy to the Dean.
- Section VII: UCRC Report:** Leave a divider or space for the UCRC report.

REVIEWERS:

REVIEW DATE:

(Note: UCRC will not review any program until Sections I-V 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?