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| All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic **program review**. The **program review** process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.  **(WASC CFR 2.7, *WASC******Handbook of Accreditation*, March 2013, p. 13)** |
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**PLNU Acronyms**

**APC** Academic Policy Committee (PLNU)

**CFR** WASC Criteria for Review

**FTE** Full Time Equivalent

**GSC** Graduate Studies Committee (PLNU)

**IE** Office of Institutional Effectiveness (PLNU)

IR Offices of Institutional Research (PLNU)

MOU Memorandum of Understanding

**SWOT** Internal strengths-weaknesses and external opportunities-threats

**WASC** Western Association of Schools and Colleges, or

**WSCUC** WASC Senior College and University Commission

**NOTE:**

Academic unit’s Program Review documents can be found in the faculty shared folder in Socrates:

* \\socrates\Shared\Faculty Shared Folder\Program Review

Program Review documents can be found on the web at: <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/>

**Program Review 5-Step Process**

(Summary Overview Includes Only the Major Steps)

|  |
| --- |
| **Step 1 – Preparation for Program Review**   * Review the Program Review Guidelines and attachments * Review the previous program review action plan and recommendations, assess the progress the Academic Unit has made in relation to what they intended to accomplish to improve student learning, following the previous program review * Receive and review data packet from the Office of Institutional Research * Prepare for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee review of Assessment planning and practices including syllabi (required before submission of program review self-study) * Meet with the Program Review Committee for an orientation to the program review process and the assignment of a Program Review Committee liaison to assist as needed * Identify how work will be divided and make assignments for all of the faculty * Submit to Program Review Committee a proposed budget and schedule for the program review |
| **Step 2 – Program Review Self-Study**   * Design a plan for the self-study including lines of inquiry and analyze prior years of SLO assessment * Complete and submit (LiveText) to the Program Review Committee the academic unit self-study (20 pages plus an additional 3 to 5 pages for each academic program/ center being reviewed plus appendices) * Submit to the Program Review Committee a list of five proposed members for an External Review Team (including their curriculum vitae, conflict of interest form, and rationale for including them on the Team) * Once the Program Review Committee indicates that the academic unit is ready for External Review, and the External Review Team members are approved by the College Dean, provide the External Team members the *Self-Study* with supporting documentation at least one month before the visit |
| **Step 3 – External Review Team Visit**   * External Review Team members collaborate by teleconference at least one week prior to the visit to plan the visit, identify issues of interest, divide the work to be accomplished and outline the report. * External Review Team visits and reports on its commendations, findings and recommendations * academic unit is invited to respond to the External Review Team recommendations regarding factual errors or misperceptions * Program Review Committee writes a draft, *Findings and Recommendations Report* |
| **Step 4 – Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)**   * Program Review Committee submits final *Findings and Recommendations Report* to the Provost * Provost, College Dean and program review liaison meet with the academic unit to draft a *MOU* with a Quality Improvement Action Plan, and discuss the program review process * Provost works with the Administrative Cabinet to address any resource implications * Provost and academic unit sign a final *MOU* with action plan that contains resourcing implications, time line, and program improvement requirements |
| **Step 5 – Program Review Implementation and Follow-up**   * Academic unit provides one-page Executive Summary to the Academic Council and President’s Cabinet * Academic unit develops and submits to Academic Policy Committee and/or Graduate Studies Committee any curricular proposals for academic and program revisions * Academic unit faculty provide feedback to the Program Review Committee on the program review process * Academic unit provides annual reports to the Program Review Committee , College Dean and Provost on progress in achieving program improvements |
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Program Review Unit of Analysis

An academic program is a defined set of courses and other requirements that students must successfully complete to obtain a specific degree, credential or certificate, as indicated in the University undergraduate and graduate catalogs. An academic unit is used here to refer to an academic department (e.g., Music) or school (e.g., School of Education). *The academic unit with more than one program and/or center may choose to conduct a program review of all of the programs and centers housed in the academic unit in a single program review cycle (simultaneously) or may elect to stagger the program reviews over multiple years (sequentially).* The assumption made here is that the academic unit conducts a program review of all programs and centers simultaneously.

The chair or dean of the academic unit should notify the provost if it is the faculty’s desire to conduct the program review for each program sequentially, over multiple program review cycles, or simultaneously, over a single program review cycle. In either case the academic unit must consider each program separately and the school as a whole within the self-study document. For example, when the Fermanian School of Business conducts a program review, whether sequential or simultaneous, in the self-study the School considers each degree program separately (e.g. M.B.A., B.S. Business Administration Accounting, B.A. Business Administration, etc.) and the School as a whole.

Overview of Academic Program Review Guidelines

Program Review is an integral part of the University’s system of accountability where faculty assess PLNU’s academic programs and continually adjust to improve their quality, effectiveness, and currency with the objective of improving student learning. The program review process is an opportunity for the faculty and staff of each academic program to collaborate in assessing their success in meeting internally defined outcomes and external benchmarks to comparable and exemplar programs. The University’s commitment to continual improvement drives its reflective processes as a learning community. There is an in-depth discussion of the history of PLNU Program Review, purpose and process is available in Appendix A.

The purpose of the Academic Program Review Guidelines is to assist faculty, administrators, external reviewers, and faculty committees by providing a framework for the PLNU program review process. The information contained here provides the academic unit faculty and staff with the necessary tools for conducting a successful program review. The Program Review Guidelines are followed by a series of appendices that offer more in-depth explanation of the processes and components of the program review. The self-study document is to be uploaded in the program review template in LiveText. Please contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for assistance.

The outcomes of a successful program review include the following: (1) improved student learning, (2) APC/ GSC proposals for academic program revision, (3) alignment with Institutional mission, core values, strategic priorities and learning outcomes, (4) increased effectiveness and efficiencies through continuous improvement, (5) a link to the University’s planning and resource allocation system, and (6) an improved educational experience for the program’s students.

According to WASC, improvements from the program review process should include some of the following (*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*, September 2009, p. 3–4):

* Developing or refining program learning outcomes and identifying appropriate means for assessing their achievement
* Better aligning department, college and institutional goals
* Refining departmental access and other interventions to improve retention/attrition, and graduation rates
* Making curricular and other changes to improve student learning and retention
* Refining, reorganizing or refocusing curricula to reflect changes in the discipline or profession
* Reorganizing or improving student support systems, including advising, library services and students development initiatives to improve the academic success of students in the program
* Designing needed professional development programs, including programs to help faculty learn how to develop and assess learning outcomes, to improve pedagogy, and to improve curricular cohesion
* Reorganizing or refocusing resources to advance student learning or specific research agendas
* Re-assigning faculty/staff or requesting new lines
* Illuminating potential intra-institutional synergies
* Developing specific action plans for modification and improvement
* Informing decision making, planning and budgeting, including resources re/allocation
* Linking and, as appropriate, aggregating program review results to the institution’s broader quality assurance/improvement efforts

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| A. Program Review History, Purpose and Design |

Getting Started: Preparing for Program Review

There are several steps the academic unit can take to prepare for the program review in order to ensure a timely and successful progression through the process. The first step is for the faculty and staff to become familiar with the Program Review Guidelines including the appendices. The Program Review Committee will meet with the academic unit chairs or deans early in the process for an orientation and review any outstanding issues. The academic unit faculty should compile a list of questions for the Program Review Committee and can send these questions to the Provost, who is the Committee chair or the designated Program Review Committee liaison.

Second, the Program Review Committee will identify a member of the Committee as a liaison between the academic unit and Committee. The faculty should meet early and frequently with the Committee liaison. The liaison will work closely with the academic unit faculty and assist them in moving through the process. The liaison will provide the academic unit feedback from the Committee as well as provide the Committee frequent updates on the academic unit’s progress (see appendix D for liaison checklist) and write the first draft of the Program Review Committee’s *Findings and Recommendations*.

Third, the academic unit is asked to submit, in the spring semester before the program review formally begins, a budget and a schedule to the Program Review Committee to review and approve. Appendix I (Template 1) is a sample budget and template. The costs associated with the program review will be assigned to PLNU cost center 5310 which is managed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. In addition, the academic unit is to prepare a two-year schedule with a timeline for progressing through the program review and should include a list of the faculty and staff assignments. Appendix I (Template 2) provides a sample schedule for the two-year program review process. It is important that the academic unit monitor and adhere to the schedule, or notify their liaison if they are falling behind schedule. There are budgetary and Committee workload planning related to the academic unit’s timeline that will be impacted if the academic unit deviates from the approved schedule.

Fourth, in the first year of the program review the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Committee will notify the academic unit regarding the Committee’s scheduled review of the academic unit’s assessment documents, assessment wheel, including course syllabi, core competency assessment, PLO signature assignments and rubrics, etc. The academic unit should begin a review and analysis of all of the assessment planning and documentation of student learning early in preparation for the program review. A full assessment review by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is required before the program review self-study is submitted to the Program Review Committee. Following the assessment review, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee will submit a report to the academic unit leadership with a copy to the Program Review Committee, appropriate curricular committees (APC and GSC), College Dean and Provost. The report will include the IE Committee’s findings, commendations and recommendations for improvement.

Early and thoughtful planning by the faculty and staff will increase the possibility for the academic unit completing the program review process on time without delays. Many academic units have found it helpful to schedule regular weekly or biweekly meetings to monitor the progress of faculty, address any questions, harmonize approaches, and to keep the process moving forward.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| C. Inclusion of Academic Assessment into the Program Review Process  D. Program Review Roles and Responsibilities  Appendix I - Templates   1. Budget to Cover the Costs of Program Review 2. Suggested Two-year Schedule for a Successful Program Review |

Six-Year Rotation for Academic Program Review

The normal academic unit rotation through program review is once every six years. This provides the program faculty with the opportunity to implement program improvements, conduct outcome-based assessment, and to evaluate the impact of program changes on student learning. Those academic programs involved with special professional accreditation may appeal to the Provost to extend or shorten the internal program review to coincide with specialized accreditation review. In no case is a program review cycle more than eight years or less than four. For any academic unit, where the Program Review Committee has expressed some concerns regarding the quality or effectiveness of its programs or assessment of student learning, the Program Review Committee may require an interim report addressing those specific areas of concern previously identified. The academic program review rotation for years 2014 through 2020 is available in Appendix B.

The program review is intended to be an opportunity for reflection on current performance and vision for the future. The expectation is that academic unit faculty, staff, students, alumni, advisory board, and other stakeholders are engaged in continuous, ongoing data collection about student performance, student competence, program effectiveness, and student success. The process is characterized by the following components: “the Self-Study inquiry and report, followed by the external review, then a formal Findings and Recommendations report, and culminating with a Memorandum of Understanding that may involve commitments from senior administrators regarding resources,” (*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*, September 2009, p. 6).

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| B. Academic Program Review rotation |

Program Review Self-Study

The self-study report is the centerpiece of program review. The self-study document is no longer than **20 pages and an additional 3 to 5 pages for each program and academic center under review** (there is no page limit for attachments, appendices, External Review Team’s findings, and other supporting documentation). The self-study with attachments is submitted in the program review template located in LiveText. Please notify the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for assistance (please see Appendix D. Program Review Roles and Responsibilities).

The Offices of Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research work together to support the academic units involved in program review. The Office of Institutional Research will provide the academic unit with a program review data packet for the self-study. The data packet will include program enrollment, admissions, completion, retention and graduation rates, etc. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will support the faculty throughout the self-study process including; assisting in the IE Committee assessment review, arrange all logistics for the External Review, and will cover budgeted costs.

The main focus of the program review is forward looking toward the next decade. The academic unit should avoid using the program review to look backward at past achievements or recording a history of the academic unit. A complete self-study template for academic units to use is provided in LiveText and outlined in Appendix (E).

The steps of the self-study process and report are as follows:

1. Alignment of the program to the University mission, core values, strategic priorities, and institutional learning outcomes. A review of the clarity, power, and appropriateness of the academic unit’s mission, program and course learning outcomes, and planning processes.
2. Analysis of the capacity and resources currently available including financial, budget, facilities, technology, and personnel.
3. Effectiveness of the academic program including assessment plans, assessment activities, evidence of student learning, curriculum, retention, graduation rates, student services, faculty effectiveness, and community engagement.
4. Comparative position with national standards for best practices, unique features, trends, etc. The program review is focused on continuous improvement for the future. It should be visionary and inspiring.
5. Summary of the program’s internal strengths and weaknesses and external threats and opportunities.
6. Memorandum of Understanding with quality improvement action plan that addresses gaps in the current performance with specific changes or revisions to improve the program for the future.
7. Themes for future inquiry: interesting questions that the program review identified but beyond the scope of the current program review analysis.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| D. Program Review Roles and Responsibilities  E. Overview of an Academic Program Review Self-study Report  K. PLNU Program Review Self-study Rubric |

External Review Purpose and Team Report

The purpose of the external review is for a team of academic experts, from outside the academic unit under review, to read the program review self-study and meet with the program faculty, students, alumni and staff, and provide an objective assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the academic program, adequacy of resources and operations, and assessment of student learning. The External Review Team will include at least two reviewers from outside the University to provide academic discipline expertise. PLNU faculty who serve on an external review team will provide administrative or accreditation expertise along with the PLNU context.

The Provost will receive the external review team’s report prior to the team’s departure from the campus and will distribute the team’s report to the academic unit, Program Review Committee, and to select administrators including the College Dean. The academic unit is invited to comment on the external review team’s recommendation regarding factual errors and/or misperceptions. The academic unit’s response becomes part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the Program Review Committee.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| F. External Review Team Procedure and Letter of Agreement |

Program Review Committee Actions

The Program Review Committee meets twice monthly and will use this time to receive progress reports from Program Review liaison assigned to the academic unit as well as review reports and supporting documentation. The Committee will receive the academic unit’s self-study and evaluate the report using the PLNU Program Review Self-Study Rubric (Appendix J). Following an in-depth analysis of the self-study, the Committee will decide if the academic unit is prepared to proceed to the External Review Team phase of the program review. If the Committee believes additional work is needed in preparation for the External Review Team visit, the program review liaison and Committee Chair (Provost) will meet with the academic unit’s chair or dean and outline the specific areas the Committee would like the academic unit to address prior to proceeding to the External Review.

Following the External Review Team’s visit, the Committee will write the first draft of the *Findings and Recommendations Report* (Appendix/Template I-3), which presents a summary overview of the entire program review process and program quality. After the academic unit’s review and comments, the Program Review Committee’s final *Findings and Recommendation* *Report* includes one of the following recommendations: (1) the Provost *approves* the program review *without conditions,* (2) the Provost *approves* the program review *with* *conditions,* or (3) the Provost *disapproves* the program review *with recommendations for revisions and resubmission.* Disapproval of a Program Review is extremely rare and signals to the academic leadership and Administrative Cabinet that changes should be considered in the academic program or leadership.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| D. Program Review Roles and Responsibilities  J. PLNU Program Review Self-Study Rubric  I. Templates   1. Program Review Committee’s Findings and Recommendations |

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Quality Improvement Action Plan

Following the Provost’s receipt of the Program Review Committee’s *Findings and Recommendations* report, the Provost, College Dean and Program Review Committee liaison will meet with the faculty of the academic unit to discuss the results of the Program Review and the action steps to be taken as a result of the review. During this meeting the College Dean and Provost will work with the academic unit to draft an initial outline of a MOU including a time line for follow-up action steps required for improvement of the program, and an outline of any additional resources including faculty, facilities, budget, technology or other resource implications requiring approval by the President’s Administrative Cabinet. In most cases the academic unit faculty will be tasked in the MOU to provide an annual update of their progress in achieving the improvements agreed to in the MOU.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| G. Memorandum of Understanding with a Quality Improvement Action Plan |

Aligning the Program Review with Institutional Planning and Budgeting

Many program review recommendations for improvement will require no additional resources. However, other recommendations may point to significant reallocation of resources or capital expenditures. In such cases the program review documents, and specifically the *Memorandum of Understanding*, serve as the foundation for incorporating the new commitment in the University budget allocation, capital expenditures, and strategic planning processes.

The program review financial analysis should include evidence gathered throughout the program review: projections for increasing or declining enrollment; implications for program direct costs including faculty, staff, operating expenses; and impact on indirect costs such as the library resources, admissions, marketing and creative services, Office of Records, and Information Technology Services. In addition, the program review may identify capital improvements that should be made to facilities, technology, or the purchase of new equipment. In such cases, the Academic Unit will work with the Provost’s office to ascertain the prioritization of the proposal for capital improvements.

Program review provides an important way for the university to link the evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. The program review documents, including the *Findings and Recommendations* and the *Memorandum of Understanding* are used as evidence to inform decision-making processes at various levels in the institution, including, strategic enrollment planning, the President’s Administrative Cabinet, curricular committees, and in some cases, the Board of Trustees.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| G. Memorandum of Understanding with an Action Plan |

Review of the Program Review Process

At the conclusion of the program review the academic unit is given an evaluation form (Appendix H) requesting their assessment of the program review process. In addition, the department chair or school dean will give brief presentation to the Academic Council and to the President’s Cabinet outlining the findings and results of its program review. Both of the presentations are approximately five minutes but not longer than ten minutes.

Prior to the Academic Council and Cabinet meetings, all related program review documents are made available electronically to the Academic Council members in the shared folder (\\socrates\shared\Faculty Shared Folder\Program Review). All Program Review documents are retained in the University’s digital archives by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Academic units also retain a copy of all related assessment and Program Review documents.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix (supporting documents) |
| H. Evaluation of the Program Review Process by the Academic Unit |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix A: Program Review History, Purpose and Design |

PLNU History of Program Review

PLNU introduced the first formal program review process in 1990. The first program review Guidelines were released in the 1992–1993 academic year laying out the requirements for a successful Program Review. This initial phase of outlining a formal program review process was used by Academic Units to guide them through the initial assessment of the academic programs. According to Dr. Ruth Heinrichs, PLNU’s first Director for Institutional Effectiveness, “In 1994, program reviews became an integral part of assessment at PLNU when the academic deans and chairpersons approved a formal plan for program review. An ad hoc committee was formed to develop assessment strategies.”

In PLNU’s Capacity Preparedness Review (CPR) of October 2006, it was noted that, “In 1994, Dr. David Strawn, Dean of Liberal Arts, developed a 5-year program review system after substantial research of post-tenure review processes and program improvement systems at other schools in the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Subsequently, no academic department could submit curricular changes without completing a well-researched, evidence-based program review that grounded their curricular recommendations. All PLNU academic departments have now completed at least one cycle of program review and most have completed two cycles. For many departments, program review resulted in substantial program improvement or development. The Department of Business, for example, sought and achieved professional program accreditation from the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) in 2000, based on its 1995–1996 program review. Several other similar professional accreditations were later sought and achieved through the program review process, including Athletic Training (2003), Music (2003) and Dietetics (2005).”

“An ad hoc Assessment Committee was created in 1994 and Dr. David Strawn was named chair. The committee agreed upon a definition of assessment, started an inventory and joined the CCCU/FIPSE project. In preparation for the 1996 WASC visit, the ad hoc Assessment Committee prepared a report entitled, "Assessment at Point Loma Nazarene College," which contained an assessment plan, expected uses of assessment data, an assessment inventory and resulting changes, assessment instruments in use, and future directions.”

“The 1996 WASC reviewers' report commended the college for these efforts but found assessment to be at an "embryonic stage" and said the process would require "monitoring and energy to move it forward." While the University had made a start, it still needed a systematic analysis of data, an integration of data into the overall assessment of the institution, and the use of this data to inform decision-making and strategic planning. In addition, data needed to focus on student learning outcomes rather than exclusively on quality of input measures.” <http://wasc.pointloma.edu/Content/Accreditation/InstitutionalPortfolio/cpr/CPRGroup6.htm>

A PLNU program review schedule, called Department/Program Review Cycle 1 (Cycle 1), with a modified review conducted five years later called Department/Program Review Cycle 2 (Cycle 2), was developed with the expectation that each academic department would complete a full program review every ten years. According to Dr. Heinrichs, “Four departments at PLNU were the first to conduct Cycle 1 reviews beginning in 1995–1996: Biology, Business, Chemistry, and History/Political Science. The final department completed its Cycle 1 review in 2001–2002. No departmental curricular or program changes could be made until Cycle 1 reviews were completed. The Cycle 1 PLNU Department/Program Review model provided specific content and directives for the academic departments.”

As reported in the University’s Educational Effectiveness Review, October 3–5, 2007, the Cycle 2 model was introduced in 2001 [h](http://wasc.pointloma.edu/Content/Accreditation/InstitutionalPortfolio/eer/GroupThree-ProgramReview.htm)ttp://wasc.pointloma.edu/Content/Accreditation/InstitutionalPortfolio  
/eer/GroupThree-ProgramReview.htm). This model was a modified departmental program review designed to assess the current status of each department, evaluate curricular trends, identify strengths and weaknesses and set a clear direction for the future. In some cases, Cycle 2 program reviews were used to “fine tune” changes made after Cycle 1. In other programs, significant changes were made following Cycle 2 reviews. In the interim, departments/schools had also engaged in more informal assessment strategies. By 2002 these strategies were formalized using the Nichols Assessment Model (James O. Nichols, *A Practitioner’s Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment Implementation*, Agathon Press: New York, 1995).

The Nichols Assessment Model as presented in *A Practitioner’s Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment Implementation,* by James O. Nichols (1995), is available through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and can provide helpful guidance to the program faculty as they consider the possible approaches to better assess their Learning Outcomes. The Nichols book also provides the faculty excellent tools for evaluating program alignment with the University mission, core values and learning outcomes. It is recommended that each Academic Unit obtain a copy of this resource as well as the WASC endorsed book *Outcomes-Based Academic and Co-Curricular Program Review*, by Marilee J. Bresciani (2006). Both of these texts serve as valuable resources during your review cycle.

In the fall of 2010, the PLNU faculty determined that a permanent faculty committee, the Program Review Committee, should be formed to support the Academic Units, to oversee the review process, and to provide recommendations on their findings to the Provost. The faculty selected the first members of the committee along with a general description of their charter. The Program Review Committee initially met in spring 2011, with the purpose of updating and program review process and guidelines. The Program Review Guidelines document and the program review self-study template are the products of the Committee’s actions.

Purpose of Program Review

PLNU seeks to be a collaborative learning community where the faculty manage and share responsibility for both the program review process and the quality of the academic programs. Program review is designed to engage faculty periodically in enhancing each academic unit’s (1) academic excellence, (2) student learning, (3) continuous improvement, (4) alignment with the Institutional mission, core values, learning outcomes, and strategic planning, (5) development of appropriate resources, and (6) design of an action plan for future program improvements.

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) define Program Review as follows: “A program review is a cyclical process for evaluating and continuously enhancing the quality and currency of programs. The evaluation is conducted through a combination of self-evaluation, followed by peer-evaluation by reviewers external to the program or department and, usually, also external to the organization. It is a comprehensive analysis of program quality, analyzing a wide variety of data about the program. The results of this evaluation process are then used to inform follow-up planning and budgeting processes at various levels in the institution—program, department, college, university—and incorporated into the institution’s overall quality assurance system. An institution’s program review process typically occurs on a regular cycle of five to eight years, meaning that each program/department is reviewed every five–eight years,” (*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review,* September 2009, p. 3).

Program review is linked to the annual assessment process that includes a systematic, periodic, collection, analysis and interpretation of student learning outcomes data to lead to continuous program improvement of the quality of a department and/or program. The program review is an opportunity for the faculty and staff, with the support of other stakeholder’s, to arrive at an objective statement as to how the department or program contributes to the fulfillment of the university mission, how it fits with similar programs in the academic community, and what are the internal strengths and weaknesses and the external opportunities and threats. The program review is the formal process by which University connects program assessment with the allocation of University resources and strategic plans.

In the area of strategic planning and resource allocation the University decided in 2011 to adopt the Dickeson model for the prioritization of academic programs and services as outlined in Richard Dickeson, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance,* Jossey Bass, 2010. The program review documents incorporate the Dickeson prioritization criteria. By aligning the program review process with the strategic planning and resource allocation processes the program review then provides important data and analysis for these functions as well as faculty input. The Dickeson model includes the following prioritization criteria:

**DICKESON Model of Criteria for PRIORITIZING ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND SERVICES**

1– History, development, and expectations of the program

2– External demand for the program

3– Internal demand for the program

4– Quality of program inputs and processes

5– Quality of program learning outcomes

6– Size, scope, and productivity of the program

7– Revenue and other resources generated by the program

8– Costs and other expenses associated with the program

9– Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program

10–Opportunity analysis of the program

Linking Institutional Resources to Program Review

Academic program improvement plan for University planning & resource allocation

The action of (1) gathering evidence, (2) analyzing data, (3) aligning the program with Institutional mission, core values, and learning outcomes, (4) enhancing educational effectiveness,   
(5) creating a MOU with an action plan and (6) communicating these through a successful program review process informs the University strategic planning processes and Institutional resource allocation. The program review components provide the foundation for effective growth and program innovation. New resources such as faculty positions, staff increases, technology improvements, budget increases, space allocations, and facility upgrades are based on a successful program review that supports the University strategic planning initiatives.

|  |
| --- |
| PROGRAM REVIEW MODEL DISTINGUISHING FEATURES  *WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review,*  (September 2009, p. 5–6) |
| * **Evidence-Based Claims and Decision-Making**   Any conclusions drawn within a self-study report or decisions made as a result of a program review are to be informed by evidence. That is, all claims within a self-study report about a program’s strengths, weaknesses, and proposed improvement plans are to be supported by relevant qualitative and/or quantitative evidence (cf., *WASC Evidence Guide*). This contrasts, for instance, with program review self-studies that are largely descriptive and based on advocacy. Hence, the section of this guide describing the components of a self-study report identifies types of evidence useful for answering questions about various aspects of a program’s quality or viability. |
| * **Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**   Evidence-based program review includes the ongoing evaluation of how well a program’s student body (in the aggregate) is achieving the stated learning outcomes (or objectives) for that program. While such assessment of student learning outcomes is independent of program review and part of ongoing faculty processes for program improvement, program reviews need to incorporate an analysis of a program’s assessment of student learning. This includes: a review of program learning outcomes; evaluation of the methods employed to assess achievement of these outcomes; and analysis and reflection on learning results, retention/ graduation rates and other outcomes data (qualitative as well as quantitative) over a multiple-year period. |
| * **Integration of Results with Planning, Budgeting, and Institutional Quality Assurance Systems**   The results of program review are to be used for follow-up planning and budgeting at various decision-making levels within the organization (program, department, college and institution). In addition, program review is to be incorporated into the institution’s broader quality assurance/improvement efforts. For example, problems found across several program reviews might be addressed institutionally as well as within individual programs. |

A program review is a means of measuring quality through the collection of evidence and benchmarking with best practices and comparable programs in the discipline. The analysis of this information presents the opportunity to reach conclusions about overall quality and recommendations for improvement. A systematic program review validates meaningful and successful programs and provides information for future directions of the institution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MOST COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT PROGRAM REVIEW  **Misconception 1: Program Review is used to evaluate faculty performance.**  No. The program review is designed to assess, evaluate, redesign, and improve the academic program, not the faculty. Faculty awareness, participation, engagement, and ownership are essential for a successful program review and is not be used to judge or evaluate individual faculty performance.  **Misconception 2: Our program is excellent, our students are learning, and we do not need to bother with a Program Review.**  Wrong. The primary purpose of a program review is continuous improvement of the quality of the educational program learning outcomes and student experience. Even if the faculty believes the quality is already excellent, there is always room for improvement. The program review is designed to inform the faculty, based on years of evidence and external review, about those areas that can be improved or strengthened.  **Misconception 3: The Chair/Dean assigns one single faculty member to conduct the Program Review in order to expedite the process and avoid conflict.**  No. Program review is only effective when it is a collaborative effort based on the evidence, reflection, synthesis, and analysis of all of the academic unit faculty and staff. Each person brings a different perspective and skill set to the table that contributes to the improvement of the program(s). Without everyone’s involvement it is difficult to receive “buy-in” and ownership of the action plan for improvement.  **Misconception 4: Assessment is a waste of time and does not benefit the students.**  Wrong. Assessment is the process by which the academic unit (1) faculty identifies the important learning outcomes, (2) aligns the program to the Institutional mission and outcomes, (3) identifies best practices in the discipline, and (4) the university can then link future resource planning to program improvements. Anything that enhances and improves the student learning outcomes is an immense value to the student, the academic unit, and University.  **Misconception 5: Program Review sounds like a great idea but it is too time-consuming, costly and complex.**  Program review is designed to build on the academic unit’s annual assessment plans. The program review is a shared responsibility of all the academic unit personnel aided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Program Review Committee. A successful program review engages the faculty, staff, students and alumni, and is well worth the individual contributions made by each member of the team. |  |

External Regional Accreditation, Specialized Accreditation and Institutional Program Review

The program review, while not the same as accreditation, is designed to align the program review process with the information to support the University’s accreditation objectives. Program review is the evaluation of a single Academic Unit or program and is used internally to assess the effectiveness and quality of the programs in achieving student learning outcomes. Internal assessment processes, including the program review, build the foundation of evidence for external accreditation, including regional accreditation (WASC) and specialized accreditation (e.g. ACBSP, CAEP, CCNE, CAATE, CSWE, CCTC, etc.).

WASC defines specialized accreditation as reviews conducted “by outside agencies which certify the professional quality of particular programs. Specialized accreditors evaluate whether or not a program meets the standards set by the disciplinary or professional body or a State licensing agency. Examples of this type of accrediting body include the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the American Bar Association (ABA), the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CCTC),”(*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*, September 2009, p. 4).

WASC regional accreditation is a review of the whole University and “focuses on the capacity (personnel, curricula, student learning, finances, infrastructure, organizational processes, etc.) and effectiveness of the college or university to meet its particular mission and its documented results in fulfilling its educational goals and outcomes. WASC expects each institution to have its own ongoing system of quality assurance and improvement: program review and assessment of student achievement are key components of this system” (*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review,* September 2009*,* p. 4).

WASC accreditation is based on four standards (listed on following page). Each of the four standards is further supported by underlying Criteria for Review (CFR) used by peer evaluators to identify those key components required for an effective assessment structure within a university. A university undergoing a WASC accreditation review is required to demonstrate the strength of the embedded assessment processes including appropriate requirements for annual assessment planning and the program review cycle.

Regional and professional accreditation as well as program review; require the academic unit to complete a thorough self-study. In order to stream line the program review process for academic units with professional accreditation, the Program Review Committee has created a separate self-study template for academic programs with professional accreditation and is available in the portal and Socrates shared folder. If the specialized accreditation requires an external visit, this same external team report may be used for Program Review. This requires approval by the Provost and coordination with the Program Review Committee.

**Source: *WASC Handbook of Accreditation,* March 2013, p. 8.**

A program review is intended to be simple, informative, and a meaningful process based on continuous improvement and flexible enough to adjust to the academic unit’s unique needs. Program review is a collaborative process involving all of the program stakeholders: students, faculty, staff, community members, school and university administrators, and external specialists in the discipline. It increases the sense of shared purpose among the many diverse academic and co-curricular programs and reinforces the need for coordinated planning for the future by all university units. The involvement of faculty from academic units outside the one being reviewed promotes university-wide understanding of the contributions of each unit to the mission of the institution. The involvement of community members who have an interest in the program emphasizes the importance of PLNU’s connections with the community it serves, furthers community understanding of the program and of PLNU, and promotes civic engagement.

|  |
| --- |
| WASC Criteria for Review (CFR), in direct support of outcome-based and evidence-based program review:   * The institution’s student learning outcomes and standards for performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment (CFR 2.3). * The institution’s student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution’s faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards (CFR 2.4). * The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students’ prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved (CFR 2.5). * The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work (CFR 2.6). * All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program’s learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations (CFR 2.7). * The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes curricula, pedagogy, and learning results (CFR 4.1). * Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes (CFR 4.3). * The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and use the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. (CFR 4.4). * Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs (CFR 4.5).   *The number following each CFR represents which of the four WASC standards and criteria is supported by the measurement. WASC Handbook of Accreditation, March 2013.* |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix B: Academic Program Review Rotation |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Point Loma Nazarene University, Academic Program Review** | | |
| **Year** | **Cohort** | **Academic Unit, Centers and Participating Programs\*** |
| 2 | 2011–12 | * School of Theology and Christian Ministry, Center for Pastoral Leadership * School of Education * Fermanian School of Business, Fermanian Business and Economic Institute, Center for International Development * Department of Art and Design |
| 3 | 2012–13 | * Department of History and Political Science * Department of Sociology and Social Work * Department of Communication and Theater * Department of Literature, Journalism and Modern Languages |
| 4 | 2013–14 | * Department of Physics and Engineering * Department of Music * Department of Family and Consumer Science * Department of School of Nursing |
| **ACADEMIC PRIORITIZATION (2012 – 2014)**  **All programs on campus required to complete a thorough financial analysis and value added assessment** | | |
| 5 | 2014–15 | * Department of Biology * Department of Chemistry * Department of Mathematical, Information, and Computer Sciences * General Education |
| 6 | 2015–2016 | * Department of Psychology * Department of Kinesiology * All Academic Centers |
| 7 | 2016-2017 | * Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences * School of Education * Fermanian School of Business |
| 8 | 2017-2018 | * School of Theology and Christian Ministry * Department of Art and Design * Extended Learning Division |

\*Some Academic Centers are not currently listed in the rotation.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix C: Inclusion of Academic Assessment into the Program Review Process |

The assessment of student learning is the foundation for program review with the focus of improving educational quality based on the culture of evidence. Assessment is conducted every semester and maintained in the Academic Unit’s Assessment Wheel <http://assessment.pointloma.edu/>. The Assessment Wheel is the official repository for the Academic Unit’s assessment plans, activities and evidence. The faculty are solely responsible for program assessment including: student learning outcomes, planning and evaluation of assessment activities, and use of evidence and criteria for success. Assessment data are collected every semester on a revolving three-year assessment cycle. During the three-year assessment cycle all program learning outcomes will be assessed in multiple ways (direct and indirect assessment). This assessment process is a continual, formative process over of data collection, analysis, reflection and improvement.

**Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degree: Core Competencies, Degree Qualification Profile, and National Tests**

“Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to document that students acquire knowledge and develop higher-order intellectual skills appropriate to the level of the degree earned. This documentation is a matter of validating institutional quality and providing accountability as well as setting the conditions for improvement of learning.” **WASC** **2013 Handbook of Accreditation, page 29.**

As part of the annual assessment process each academic unit with undergraduate programs will assess seniors on the five core competencies identified in WASC Criteria for Review (CFR) 2.2a: 1) written communication, 2) oral communication, 3) information literacy, 4) quantitative reasoning, and 5) critical thinking. All graduating seniors are to be assessed on the core competencies near the time of graduation or end of program. In preparation of the program review, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee will support the academic unit faculty in conducting an inventory and evaluation of its program’s assessment planning and activities.

**WASC CFR 2.2a**–*Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, and appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others.*

**WASC Institutional Review Process: EDUCATIONAL QUALITY**

The five core competencies listed in the Handbook are relevant in virtually any field of study, though different fields may define these outcomes in dif­ferent ways and may also include other outcomes. At many institutions, it is the assessment of learn­ing in the major or professional field that engages faculty and produces the most useful findings. Thus institutions may wish to embed assessment of core competencies in assessment of the major or professional field. Capstones, portfolios, research projects, signature assignments, internships, and comprehensive examinations provide rich evi­dence that can be analyzed for multiple outcomes, both specialized and common to all programs, at a point close to graduation as determined by the institution. Whatever the expectations and find­ings, they need to be contextualized and discussed in this component of the institutional report.

***WASC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation, July 1, 2013***

|  |
| --- |
| **Linking the Assessment of Student Learning to Institutional Budgeting and Planning** |

**Academic Assessment Committee**

**STEP 2: Assessment Committee Rubric Review**

**STEP 1: Academic Unit Assessment**

**STEP 3: Assessment Report w/ rubric scores**



**STEP 4: Program Review Data, Self-study & External Review**

**Curricular Proposals and Reports**

**Program Review Committee**

**Curriculum Committees**

Assessment Wheel, NILOA Transparency Framework

http://assessment.pointloma.edu/

**Curriculum Committee Review**

**STEP 5: MOU and Annual Reports**

**Academic Curricular and Programmatic Changes**

Budget Review and Planning

**Strategic Planning & Processes**

Academic units with graduate programs are also to assess the quality of their programs based on appropriate outcomes for graduate level rigor and competency. Graduate programs may want to consider the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) with nationally piloted outcomes for the graduate level (<http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/DQP/DQP2.0-draft.pdf>). WASC Handbook states, “Graduate programs and graduate-only institutions are expected to define and assess the generic intellectual competencies that are foundational in their field. CFR 2.2b, which refers to graduate programs, calls for expectations that are “clearly differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of standards of performance and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs also set standards of performance, choose assessment methods, interpret the results, and act on findings in ways that make sense for the program and institution.”

**WASC CFR 2.2b** The institution’s graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students’ active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. ***WASC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation, July 1, 2013***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Program Assessment Inventory** | | |
| **Assessment Activity** | **Institutional Effectiveness Committee Rubric**  **HIGHLY DEVELOPED** | **Faculty and IE Committee Comments** |
| ***Program Mission Alignment*** | * Aligned with the university mission, core values, ILOs * Reviewed and current with external guild standards |  |
| ***Program Learning Outcomes*** | * Clear and measureable PLOs * Aligned with ILOs * Higher levels on Bloom’s taxonomy |  |
| ***Curriculum Map*** | * All courses for the program major are mapped to one or more learning outcomes * Map indicates whether a PLOs is introduced, developed or mastered in a specific course * All PLOs are mastered during the program |  |
| ***Assessment Plan*** | * A three-year rotation where all PLOs are assessed as a minimum at the mastery level (summative) and some at the development (formative) and/or introductory level (value added) * Plan indicates the assessment assignments, courses for assessment, rubrics, & criteria for success |  |
| ***Direct Assessment*** | * All PLOs have a minimum of one direct assessment and a total of three assessment activities including both direct & indirect * Direct assessment activities or assignments are a measure of achievement of the PLO * Assessment rubric, rating scale or evaluation activity is a clear measure of the intended outcomes |  |
| ***Indirect Assessment*** | * All PLOs have a minimum of one indirect assessment and a total of three assessment activities including both direct & indirect * Indirect assessment activities are an indirect measure (survey focus group) of intended student learning |  |
| ***Evidence of Student Learning*** | * Assessment evidence is collected and continuously updated * Assessment evidence is systematically reviewed and analyzed by program faculty * Adjunct faculty are intentionally included in all assessment reviews |  |
| ***Use of evidence*** | * Curricular and program improvements are based on the evidence of student learning * APC & GSC proposals are supported with evidence of student learning |  |
| ***Program Syllabi and Course Learning Outcomes*** | * All program courses have Master syllabi with Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and PLOs identified * The same PLO assessment assignments and rubric are used in all sections of the same course * Syllabus indicates which assignments are used for PLO assessment and how the activity will be assessed (rubric, scoring guide, etc. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| APPENDIX D – Program Review Roles and Responsibilities |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Review Processes and Responsibilities** | | |
| **Action Item** | **Responsibility** | **Action** |
| 1. Oversees and manages the program review process | Program Review Committee | Program review liaison works closely with the academic unit faculty |
| 1. Program review two-year Schedule and Budget | Academic unit proposes | PR Committee & College Dean approve (Cost Center 5310) |
| 1. Program review data packet and data requests | Director of Institutional Research | Academic unit incorporates in self-study |
| 1. Inventory and evaluation of assessment activities, plans, and evidence | Academic unit faculty with the support of the IE Committee faculty | Academic unit reviews, prepares and incorporates in the self-study |
| 1. Self-study report | Academic unit writes: all program faculty, staff, students, and alumni participate | Program Review Committee receives, evaluates & makes recommendations |
| 1. External Review Team members | Academic unit recommends list to the Program Review Committee | College Dean approves based on recommendation of the Committee |
| 1. **E**xternal Review Team logistical support and arrangements | Academic unit and Office of Institutional Effectiveness | Academic unit leadership and Director of Institutional Effectiveness coordinate |
| 1. External Review Team report | External Review Team writes and submits report | Provost receives report prior to the Team’s departure from the campus |
| 1. Program Review Committee Findings and Recommendations | Program Review Committee writes in consultation with College Dean | Academic unit receives the draft and comments. The final report forwarded to the Provost |
| 1. Memorandum of Understanding | Academic unit drafts MOU with assistance from PR liaison, College Dean and Provost | Academic unit leadership, College Dean, and Provost sign with approval of the Cabinet for any new resource commitments |
| 1. Report to the Academic Council and the President’s Cabinet | Academic unit prepares the 5–10 minute summary | Chair or Dean of the Academic Unit makes the summary presentation of Program Review Findings |
| 1. Exceptions to the program review process requests | Academic unit requests | Provost approves |

The program review self-study is expected to be completed in two academic years. The first year is an internal analysis of the Academic Unit’s strengths and weaknesses, including an assessment of learning outcomes, student demographics, faculty scholarly and professional activity, and program curricula and pedagogy. The second year is an external analysis involving benchmarking against comparator schools, best practices and guild standards, innovative programming, alumni satisfaction, focus groups, and the External Review Team visit. Department faculty, staff, students and alumni are encouraged to be engaged in the program review with specific attention focused on continual improvement.

Academic Unit

The responsibility for conducting program review belongs to the department, school or other university unit in which the program is housed. The review is to be led by the chair or school dean, and all faculty and staff are required to participate. All academic units are scheduled for review over a six-year cycle. If the department/school also conducts periodic peer review for the purposes of specialized accreditation, the accreditation and program review processes are to be carefully coordinated to minimize duplication of faculty time and effort. Academic unit criteria for effective Program Review:

* All academic unit personnel review and familiarize themselves with the Program Review Guidelines including appendices
* All academic unit personnel participate in the program review process and share equally in the overall responsibility for defining issues, analyzing evidence, and formulating a plan
* The self-study is an open and candid assessment of the program leading to insights for continuous improvement with special attention given to student learning
* The academic unit provides digital and hard copies of the self-study with appendices for each member of the Program Review Committee, External Review Team, College Dean and Office of Institutional Effectiveness
* The academic unit will prepare an Exhibit Room (may be digital) for the External Review Team to review artifacts of faculty and student work
* External review is based on the best practices of nationally recognized programs, meeting and exceeding guild standards, and appropriate external benchmarking
* The academic unit develops a quality improvement plan that can be resourced, sustained, and implemented and that leads to improvements

Academic units must retain all documentation, survey results, meeting minutes, assessment plans, and other supporting documents pertaining to program review. These documents should be maintained in the Department’s Shared Folder and the program review folder in the Socrates/Faculty Shared Folder. In addition, the academic unit is to retain materials related to ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes in the Assessment Wheel, including the mission statement, learning outcomes, curriculum map, assessment assignments, rubrics, and assessment results. The academic unit’s records should include a representative sample of student work products, rubrics, evaluative instruments, and annual assessment reports.

**Office of the Provost**

The Provost is the chair of the Program Review Committee that oversees the integrity, efficiency and effectiveness of the process. The Provost, College Dean, and program review liaison meet early in the process with the Academic Unit leadership to address any questions or concerns. The Provost, College Dean, Program Review Committee liaison and academic unit leadership meet throughout the program review process to facilitate the process. Provost’s role in an effective program review:

* Serves as chair of the Program Review Committee
* Reviews, represents, and recommends to the President’s Administrative Cabinet any increase or decrease to resources as a result of an Academic Unit’s program review
* Hosts an exit meeting with the External Review Team and receives its report at the end of their visit
* Receives the Program Review Committee’s *Findings and Recommendations Report*
* Oversees the drafting of the *Memorandum of Understanding* (MOU) with the assistance of the College Dean, program review liaison and the chair or dean of the Academic Unit
* Reviews and approves or denies all exception requests to the Program Review Guidelines (e.g. extended time line, increase in program review budget, additional External Review Team members, etc.) All exception requests are submitted to the Provost who may consider the recommendation of the Program Review Committee and College Dean.

College Dean’s Participation

The Academic Unit leadership and faculty meet with the respective College Dean to discuss the proposed program review schedule, resourcing needs, analysis and findings. The College Dean will offer timely feedback on the self-study, data analysis and findings, as well as the development of the Memorandum of Understanding. When requested, the College Dean will confer with the Academic Unit, will accompany the academic unit’s faculty to Program Review Committee meetings, and will interview the External Review Team. The College Dean’s oversight includes the following:

* Works directly with academic unit and program review liaison in the program review process and monitors the academic unit’s progress
* Gives final approval for the membership of the External Review Team members
* The Provost may seek the College Dean’s recommendations for any exceptions requested by the academic unit
* Makes recommendations to the Program Review Committee regarding the self-study report, schedule, budget, and quality of the program review process and documents
* Works with the Provost and academic unit in drafting the Memorandum of Understanding

Academic Program Review Committee

The Academic Program Review Committee has responsibility for supporting, guiding and assessing the program review process. The Program Review Committee members are elected by the faculty and work with the academic program faculty and administrative leadership to ensure alignment with institutional learning outcomes, mission, core values, and planning processes. Throughout the program review process the Program Review Committee assists the Academic Unit.

A member of the Committee is assigned as the liaison to an academic unit, makes recommendations to the full Committee regarding the quality of the academic unit’s review process, and will identify any concerns that may require the Committee’s direct involvement. The Committee meets with External Review Team members, and writes the final report of *Findings and Recommendations* to the Provost and Academic Unit.

The Program Review Committee receives and reviews the Institutional Effectiveness Committee report on the quality of the assessment planning and activities for each academic unit. The Committee also maintains a copy of the data packet from the Office of Institutional Research as well as other evidence used by the University in decision-making about the quality and sustainability of each academic program.

The Academic Unit submits in LiveText to the Program Review Committee the self-study document at the beginning of the second year of the two-year process. The Committee reviews the self-study using the Program Review Rubric (Appendix J). The Committee determines whether or not the academic unit is prepared to proceed to the External Review or if there is a need for additional preparation. If further information is required then the Committee liaison and Provost will meet with the academic unit Chair or Dean and specify what additional information is required prior to proceeding to an External Review.

The Program Review Committee meets with the External Review Team during the visit at the beginning and the end. Following the External Review Team’s visit and report, the Committee prepares for the Provost a draft report on the Committee’s *Findings and Recommendations* (Appendix I – Template (3)). The Committee can make one to the following three recommendations: (1) the Provost *approves* the program review *without conditions,* (2) the Provost *approves* the program review *with* *conditions,* or (3) the Provost *disapproves* the program review *with recommendations for revisions and resubmission.* Disapproval of a program review is extremely rare and signals to the academic leadership and Administrative Cabinet that changes should be considered in the academic program or leadership.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Review Liaison Checklist to Assess Progress toward Successful Completion of the Program Review** | | | **Exceeds expectations (5) - no progress (1)** |
| **Semester 3** | **Check list questions** | **Assessment of Progress** |
| 1 | Has the academic unit notified the Institutional Effectiveness Committee that they are ready for the IE Committee to assess the assessment wheels? |  |  |
| 2 | Has the academic unit contacted the Program Review Committee about the timeline for submitting the self-study? What is the projected date for submission? Has the College Dean been informed? |  |  |
| 3 | Has the academic unit completed a list of potential reviewers with CVs, contact information, and rationale for selecting them? |  |  |
| 4 | Has the academic unit prepared a list of department documents and student artifacts for the External Reviewers? |  |  |
| 5 | Has the academic unit received approval from the college dean or Provost to proceed with the external review? Has the academic unit prepared a draft schedule for reviewers? |  |  |
| 6 | Does the academic unit understand the feedback from the PR Committee on the self-study? Is there any clarification needed? Do you understand next steps? |  |  |
| 7 | Is the academic unit working with the college dean and provost in selection of the External Review team members? When is the visit scheduled? |  | nr |
| 8 | Has the academic coordinated the external review team visit logistics with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness? |  | nr |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Semester 4** | **Check list questions** | **Assessment of progress/ comments** |  |
| 9 | Has the academic unit prepared a check list with all of the details leading up to and during the External Review team visit? |  | nr |
| 10 | How is the academic unit involving students, alumni, adjuncts and advisory council in the external review visit? Does the academic unit have an exhibit area prepared for the external review team? |  |  |
| 11 | Has the academic unit prepared an action plan that will form the basis for the MOU? Has this been updated with findings from the External Review team visit? |  |  |
| 12 | Has the academic unit reviewed the Program Review Committee's Findings and Recommendations Report? Are there any questions? |  |  |
| 13 | Is the academic unit working with the college dean and Provost on the MOU? What questions or issues are still unresolved? |  |  |
| 14 | Has the academic unit completed the Program Review Evaluations form? |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Academic Program Review Committee Membership and Responsibility**  **(Approved by faculty, December 2012)**  **Elected Members (by faculty): 5**   * A current or past department chair/school dean from the College of Arts and Sciences * A current or past department chair/school dean from the College of Social Sciences and Professional Studies * A faculty member at large representing graduate studies who has served on GSC or who has had significant experience with external accreditation * A faculty member at large representing undergraduate studies who has served on APC or who has had significant experience with external accreditation * A faculty member at large from the School of Education who has had significant experience with external accreditation   **Ex-officio Members: 2**   * Provost (or designee) * WASC Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO)   **Resource Personnel (as needed)**   * Chair of the Academic Policy Committee (or designee) * Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee (or designee) * Director of Institutional Research * Vice President for Finance (or designee)   **Meetings**   * Length of tenure for elected members: Three-year staggered term * Committee Chair: Provost (or designee) * Suggested frequency of meeting: Monthly or as needed     **Academic Program Review Committee’s Responsibilities**   * Review, update and implement the Program Review Guidelines. * Maintain and oversee the academic and co-curricular program review calendars and processes. * Provide support to the academic units going through Program Review. * Provide evaluative feedback to academic units that have submitted Program Review documents. * Communicate with the chairs of APC and GCS when a Program Review has been completed and Program Review documents are available for viewing. |

Offices of Institutional Effectiveness

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) will assist the Academic Unit throughout the program review process by providing administrative, logistic, and budgetary support. The Director is the Chair of the IE Committee and will support the Institutional Effectiveness Committee faculty who will work with the Academic Unit faculty in conducting a thorough inventory and evaluation of the Academic Unit’s assessment activities and data. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will work with the Academic Unit personnel to plan all of the events, activities and logistics for the External Review Team visit.

Offices of Institutional Research

During the spring semester prior to the fall semester start of the two-year program review process, the Office of Institutional Research (IR) will present the academic unit with a program review data set. The Director of IR will collaborate with the department/school in providing the appropriate data, interpretation, and analysis to inform the self-study. The Director of IR will work with the Academic Unit faculty throughout the program review process to support their data requests.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix E: Overview of an Academic Program Review Self-Study Report |

The program review is intended to be an opportunity for reflection on current performance in achieving student learning outcomes and visioning for the future. The expectation is that the Academic Unit faculty, staff, students, alumni, advisory board, and others with a commitment to the success of the program will be engaged in continuous, ongoing data collection about student learning, student satisfaction, program effectiveness and student success. Current and former students should be involved in all aspects of the program review and take a key role in shaping the program to achieve student learning outcomes.

The program review is the time when the Academic Unit pauses and makes an in-depth analysis that most often leads to a major program redesign and/or revision of programs and services. The process is characterized by the following components: (1) a 20-page Self-Study document, with an additional 3 to 5 pages for each academic program and center, along with supporting appendices, (2) External Review Team’s report, (3) Program Review Committee’s *Findings and Recommendations* *Report*, and (4) a signed *Memorandum of Understanding* (MOU) with a Quality Improvement Action Plan. The Academic Unit Self-Study is the heart of the two-year program review process.

**Academic Program Review Self-Study highlights these components:**

1. Alignment of the program to the University mission, core values, strategic plan, and learning outcomes. A review of the clarity, power, and appropriateness of the Academic Unit’s mission, learning outcomes, and planning processes.
2. Educational effectiveness of the academic program including assessment plans, curriculum, retention, graduation rates, student services, faculty effectiveness, and community engagement.
3. Review of the adequacy and sustainability of the resources currently available including faculty, student demand, financial, budget, facilities, technology, and personnel.
4. Comparative position with national standards for best practices, unique features, trends, etc. The program review is focused on continuous improvement for the future. It should be visionary and inspiring.
5. Summary of internal strengths and weaknesses and external threats and opportunities.
6. Themes for future inquiry are interesting questions that the program review identified but beyond the scope of the current program review analysis.

**PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY REPORT**

**(Template is available in LiveText. Please contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness)**

**Introduction**

The introduction includes a brief summary (1 to 1 ½ pages) of the program and may include a description of changes made in the program since the last program review. The academic program leadership may want to provide internal context including a summary of majors, minors, centers, and other features important to assessment. The Self-Study introduction may also include an external context such as the constituencies served beyond the immediate campus. This section sets the stage for the Self-Study that follows.

**ISSUES TO ADDRESS**

1. **Name of Academic Unit, Program(s), and Center(s)**

The program review document should begin with a list of the programs and centers to be reviewed including graduate and undergraduate, undergraduate majors, minors and concentrations. At this point the academic unit will need to decide if they will write a single program review report for all of their programs and center(s) or if they will write a separate report for each program and/or center(s). It is assumed that the academic unit (department or school) will conduct a program review of all their programs and center(s) at the same time. If the faculty prefer to conduct sequential program reviews over multiple review cycles the Academic Unit leadership should contact the Provost and Program Review Committee with its request.

1. **Program Overview**

The description should orient the reader to your program, including items such as highlights, high impact practices, general education courses, and service courses and programs. Describe major events in the academic program including formation of new centers, addition of internships, new service opportunities, specialized accreditation, new affiliations, and the Advisory Council, etc.

1. **Summary of Recommendations from Previous Program Review**

List the findings from the previous program review and discuss actions taken and program improvements since last program review. Include a discussion of the past three to five annual assessment reports and findings, APC/GSC actions, new courses, program revisions, added support services, etc.

1. **Brief History, Development, and Expectations of the program (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criteria No. 1)**

It is helpful to have a brief history (1 to 2 pages) of an academic unit and the evolution of programs within that unit to serve external demand, internal demand for courses such as general education or a minor, and expectations of majors. For example, a program may have been created to respond to student needs, to meet a market demand, or around a specific professor’s research interests or other driving forces which will change over time.

For each of the programs the academic unit and faculty could address the following issues:

* Why was the program established?
* What are its academic antecedents?
* How has the program evolved over the years?
* What were the institution’s original expectations?
* How have those expectations changed?
* What were the origins of initial support?
* What is the degree to which the program has adapted to meet change?
* What is the degree to which the program has adapted to the changing demographic characteristics of the institution’s students?

From Robert C. Dickeson, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*, 2010, p. 71.

Using the data set provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Accounting and Finance, and other evidence gathered, describe the enrollment trends, migration to and from major(s) and minor(s), changes in academic profile of students coming into the major, and retention and graduation rates, Academic Unit costs (Delaware Study), etc.

|  |
| --- |
| PART I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Objectives (WASC Standard 1) |

The focus of this section is on the alignment of the program to the Institution mission, core values, and strategic purposes and should provide a check to the faculty if the program has experienced “mission drift.” The Nichols text, *A Practitioner’s Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment Implementation* (see chapter 4, pp. 138–171), will assist the Academic Unit in analyzing the program’s alignment with the University mission and core values. Faculty should also use this opportunity to review the currency and appropriateness of the program mission/purpose statement (vision and core values) and how this informs the Program Learning Outcomes.

|  |
| --- |
| **University Mission**  Point Loma Nazarene University exists to provide higher education in a vital Christian community where minds are engaged and challenged, character is modeled and formed, and service becomes an expression of faith. Being of Wesleyan heritage, we aspire to be a learning community where grace is foundational, truth is pursued, and holiness is a way of life. |

**Learning Outcomes (Program and Student) and Institutional Alignment:** The program review is an outcomes-based review that measures educational effectiveness in terms of what the Academic Unit has identified as the important Learning Outcomes. Under the current model, faculty ensures that program and student learning outcomes are aligned with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (below). Faculty reviews how carefully Learning Outcomes are mapped (curricular map) to signature assignments and whether or not appropriate rubrics are in place for assessment.

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning, Informed by our Faith in Christ**  **Outcome:** Members of the PLNU community will display openness to and mastery of foundational knowledge and perspectives, think critically, analytically, and creatively, and communicate effectively. |
| **Growing, In a Christ-Centered Faith Community**  **Outcome**: Members of the PLNU community will demonstrate God-inspired development and understanding of self and others; live gracefully within complex professional, environmental and social contexts. |
| **Serving, In a Context of Christian Faith**  **Outcome:** Members of the PLNU community will engage in actions that reflect Christian discipleship in a context of communal service and collective responsibility, serve both locally and globally. |

**Academic Unit Goals:** In this section the faculty may include a discussion of other *stretch* *goals* related to the curriculum, pedagogy, student and faculty scholarship, student service opportunities, diversity goals and other aspects of quality improvement for academic excellence.

* + Statement of program objectives, including relationship to school, college and institutional strategic plan
  + Specific goals in the areas of teaching and learning; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and civic engagement (attach all relevant documents and policy statements)
  + Reflection on any recent national or global changes in the academic discipline

**KEY FINDINGS**

Each section of the self-study should end with a summary of key findings and recommendations. This summary assists the reader in quickly identifying the important recommendations made by the academic unit faculty, staff and students. These recommendations form the basis of the Memorandum of Understanding.

**Example**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institutional and Program Alignment of**  **Vision, Mission, Core Values, and Learning Outcomes** | |
| **Key Findings** | **Recommendations** |
| * Department mission, core values and program learning outcomes are consistently aligned with the University | * No change necessary |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| PART II: Core Commitment to Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability |

*Institutions recognize that the public has entrusted them with the critical responsibilities of upholding the values of higher education and contributing to the public good. They engage in sound business practices, demonstrate institutional integrity, operate in a transparent manner, and adapt to changing conditions*. ***WASC Handbook of Accreditation*, March 2013, p. 6**

This section includes a summary overview of the program’s resources including faculty profile, student profile, diversity profile, faculty load, staff, and budget. Academic Unit should discuss the changes and trends in the program and findings regarding the Academic Unit’s efficiency and ability to support the growth or decline in the program. Specifically address diversity goals, student support services, academic advising loads, administrative loads, and scholarship support and enhancements.

The question of program viability should include: (1) analysis of enrollment and retention data, (2) discussion regarding changes in the academic discipline or professional standards, (3) increase or decline in student demand for the program, (4) resource allocation including faculty to student ratios, faculty load, external funding, etc., (5) student support services including library, research support, technical resources, career services, and (6) Academic Unit resources including staff, faculty research support, facilities, budget, etc.

**ISSUES TO ADDRESS**

1. **External demand for the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services,* Criterion No. 2)**

**Analysis of enrollment trends and retention data**

What are the national and regional enrollment trends for the program(s)? Based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, what are the past five (5) year enrollment trends for the majors and minors, retention and graduation rates?

Please work with the Office of Institutional Research to review and interpret the data. Summarize your findings.

1. **Internal demand for the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 3)**

Do our programs support university’s internal program needs such as general education, minor supporting other majors, service courses, courses required for other majors such as nursing or business? How many units are generated by non-majors as compared to majors? If the program(s) were changed or discontinued, how would other programs in other Academic Units or co-curricular programs be affected? Are students migrating into or out of the programs and from which majors?

1. **Size, scope, and productivity of the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 6)**

Comment on the program faculty profile (numbers, rank, teaching load, administrative load release, etc.). For each program include the criteria used by the Academic Unit in the assignment of faculty to teach undergraduate and graduate courses, and serve on committees that administer the culminating experience (thesis, action research, honors project, comprehensive exams, Teaching Performance Assessments, etc.) and for determining undergraduate and graduate adjunct faculty assignments.

Briefly summarize and discuss the students being served by the program such as a demographic profile of majors and other students served by the program. The Academic Unit might consider:

* Characteristics of students majoring in the program (e.g. enrollment numbers, SAT scores, GPA, and other relevant characteristics).
* Demographic characteristics of majors and minors in terms of diversity, ethnicity, gender, etc. Where information is available by class (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate) and any observed trends.
* Types and levels of financial assistance available to students.
* Academic and career services, programs, and resources.
* Basic skill remediation, tutoring, supplemental instruction.
* Orientation and program activities to build community.
* Number of students in service activities and type of activities.

1. **Revenue and other resources generated by the program (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 7)**

Review the revenue trends provided by the Office of Finance and Accounting. Are there sources of revenue in addition to tuition being generated such as grants, fundraising, and continuing education courses?

1. **Costs and other expenses associated with the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 8)**

Comment on the department’s budget resources and include budgets and actual expenses for past three years. The Academic Unit will be provided past budgets and expenses by the Office of Accounting and Finance. Other information that may be provided are national benchmarks by major in terms of costs and FTEs.

1. **Quality of program inputs and processes (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 4)**

* **Faculty**

Discuss the ratios of full-time to adjunct and part time faculty teaching courses over past three years. What is the proportion of faculty with terminal degrees, tenure, rank, length of time at PLNU, etc? How have these ratios changed over the past five years? Are there planned retirements in the near future?

* **Adequacy and Availability**

Discuss the faculty needs and identify any gaps. Summarize the evidence of success in recruiting key faculty and staff. Comment on any curricular areas for which the department has difficulty hiring.

* **Professional Development/Travel Support**

Comment on the adequacy and availability of institutional support and outside funding for professional development and travel.

* **Technology**

Discuss the program’s use of technology in the classrooms, faculty offices, library, and labs. Comment on the adequacy of the technological resources and support. Forecast any future needs in the area of instructional technology.

**Information and technology resources**

* Library print and electronic holdings in the teaching and research areas of the program
* Information literacy outcomes for graduates
* Technology resources available to support the pedagogy and research in the program
* Faculty development in online pedagogy
* **Facilities and other**

Discuss the adequacy in the areas of faculty offices, classrooms, and other facilities and space allocation. Comment on the availability and use of library resources and Institutional support services. Issues to consider might include: classroom space, instructional laboratories and technology support, research laboratories, office and meeting spaces.

* **Staff**

Describe and discuss the administrative, clerical, technical, and other administrative service support. This is an excellent opportunity to review job descriptions (these may be included in the appendices as supporting documentation).

* **Student Profile**

Briefly summarize and discuss the demographics, preparation, and general performance of majors and other students served by the program. Describe any significant changes in enrollment, retention, and graduation. This section should include the following components:

* + Characteristics of students majoring in the program (e.g., enrollment numbers, SAT scores, GPA, and other relevant characteristics)
  + Description of recruitment practices and admissions criteria, if different from standard University admissions practices
    - Activities and resources that serve students who declare a major in the department but have not yet met the department’s entrance requirements
    - The number of students who have declared a major in the department but failed to meet the department’s entrance guidelines (if applicable)
  + Types and levels of financial assistance available to students
  + Academic and career services, programs, and resources
  + Basic skill remediation, tutoring, supplemental instruction
  + Orientation and program activities to build community
  + Number and percentages of women, minorities, international students in the population of majors
  + Number of students in service activities
* **Course Profile:** Briefly summarize and discuss the number of courses offered, class and lab sizes small-large-mean, the percentage of classes taught by full-time faculty and other relevant course data for the past three years. Include any other information regarding lab and course resources.
* **Resource Profile:** Overview of the physical environment for the program, including instructional technologies, other equipment, and supplies. Briefly summarize and evaluate the adequacy of the budget, facilities, equipment, and computing and support services available to the program. Discuss information literacy among the students in the program.

|  |
| --- |
| PART III: Core Commitment to Student Learning and Success |

*Institutions have clear educational goals and student learning outcomes. Institutions collect, analyze, and interpret valid and reliable evidence of learning as a way of assessing student achievement and success. Institutions support the success of all students and seek to understand and improve student success*. ***WASC Handbook of Accreditation*, March 2013, p. 6**

Educational effectiveness is the core of the program review self-study and focuses the effectiveness of the academic unit to achieve program and student learning outcomes. This part of the self-study is the opportunity for reflection and analysis. WASC suggests, “To facilitate meaningful analysis of the evidence, it is helpful to provide guiding questions to structure the self-study inquiry and report. These questions often produce deep discussions among faculty and are considered the most important aspect of the self-study process” (*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review,* September 2009, p. 8).

**ISSUES TO ADDRESS**

1. **Quality of Program Learning Outcomes (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 5)**

Summarize the status of assessment of student learning in the program including a discussion of the program assessment activities. Include a description of actions taken in response to information gained from assessment. This section should include a discussion of evaluation methods used for each outcome and how the faculty and staff will know outcomes are being reached. Provide an overview of the annual assessment results since the last program review and how the annual assessments have evolved and informed the Academic Unit for continuous improvement.

Discuss how the Academic Unit intentionally designs program, activities and support services to achieve learning outcomes. Evaluate how the learning outcomes are communicated and understood by students, staff and faculty and explain the design of evaluating measures to assess learning outcomes. The program review should focus on whether students are achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program and the school/Academic Unit. This section should analyze the learning outcomes and reflect on the appropriateness and assessment of the learning outcomes. Include as attachments current Assessment Plan as well as all reports of specific assessments the program has conducted in the past six years. Evidence to include:

* Annual results of direct and indirect assessments of student learning in the program (could be combination of quantitative and qualitative measures), including the degree to which students achieve the program’s desired standards
* Ongoing efforts by the department to “close the loop” by responding to assessment results
* Student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories)
* Placement of graduates into graduate school or post-doctoral experiences
* Job placements
* Graduating student satisfaction surveys (and/or alumni satisfaction surveys)
* Employer critiques of student performance or employer survey satisfaction results
* Disciplinary ratings of the program
* Student/Alumni achievements (e.g. community service, research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments, etc.)

*From WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*, September 2009, p. 9.

1. **Curriculum**

**Structure/coherence of instructional program**

Assess the appropriateness of the structure, rigor, quality, currency, comprehensiveness, adequacy, coherence, and delivery of the curriculum. Describe any changes made in the program’s curriculum in response to outcomes assessment. The Self-Study may report recent recognitions/awards for innovative curriculum and/or outstanding students, or external funding for curricular innovation or reform. Include tables of course enrollment over past three years. Discuss any course enrollment issues such as low (under 10) or high enrollment.

For graduate programs include the guidelines for culminating experiences such as thesis, action research, honors project.

**Cooperative programs and initiatives with other academic programs (joint degrees, service courses, general education courses)**

Evaluate the program’s effectiveness in cooperatively offering joint degrees, shared courses, service courses, cross-listed courses, and/or General Education courses.

1. **Program Faculty**

Write a summary of the qualifications and achievements of the program faculty. Examine how the current faculty enhances the program’s mission, core values, learning outcomes and goals. Describe contribute to the quality of the program. (The program review might consider including CVs of full-time faculty as attachments.) Include:

* Development of faculty for online modality and pedagogy
* Proportion of the faculty with terminal degree
* Institutions from which faculty earned terminal degree
* List of faculty specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)
* Teaching quality (e.g. peer evaluations, faculty self-review, teaching evaluations)
* Record of scholarship for each faculty member
* Faulty participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning and/or assessment
* External funding awarded to faculty
* Record of professional practice for each faculty member
* Service contributions made by each faculty member
* Distribution of faculty across ranks (or years at the institution)
* Diversity of faculty
* Awards and recognition

*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*, September 2009, p. 10.

Discuss the program faculty profile information and the academic unit’s ability to provide currency, expertise, and effective teaching for the next five years. Identify any current or future known gaps in academic expertise based on changes in the program(s) or faculty assignments, retirements or moves. Prepare a five year plan for faculty hiring, retiring, and promotion. Discuss the process used for hiring and assigning adjunct faculty. Discuss the academic unit’s process for initiating, supporting and developing faculty including adjunct and part-time faculty.

**Development of the effectiveness of teaching and learning**

Describe the program faculty members’ activities to continuously improve classroom research, innovative instruction, and scholarship of teaching and learning. Discuss the impact of this scholarly work and creative activities on the curriculum and on student engagement and learning.

1. **Credit Hour Policy and Monitoring**

The Department of Education (March 18, 2011) has mandated that all universities receiving Federal financial aid will have a definition of a credit hour and a policy for ensuring adherence to the credit hour definition. The definition should reasonably approximate the Carnegie unit in terms of student work needed to achieve program learning outcomes. PLNU credit hour policy is defined in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

In addition, WASC is required by Department of Education, as of July 1, 2011, to “conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution’s assignment of credit hour used for Federal program purposes.” In the program review self-study the academic unit is required to demonstrate how the unit monitors course instruction time to ensure compliance with the University’s Credit Hour policy and federal regulations. The academic unit should be specific in identifying how and when the Credit Hour policy is communicated to full-time and adjunct faculty and safe guards used by the unit to assess the accuracy of its monitoring system.

1. **Recruitment, Retention, and Student Services**

Discuss any recruitment, retention, and support services for students (advising, mentoring, career development, conferences, and student placement) provided by the Academic Unit for the program. Comment on efforts in terms of the quality, success, and diversity of the student population.

1. **Disciplinary, Professional, and Community Interactions**

Summarize opportunities for student internships, employment, and other high impact practices and/or professional development programs as well as the ways in which external communities interact with students and/or the curriculum. Comment on ways in which program faculty, students and the various community stakeholders form partnerships and comment on any programmatic interactions with the off-campus regional community, any related professional communities, and/or community experts.

1. **Post-Graduation Outcomes and Alumni Satisfaction**

Summarize and discuss data and surveys regarding alumni satisfaction and success, graduate program admission, and post-graduation employment.

Program review is designed to lead to specific curricular proposals for program improvement. This might include academic proposals requiring approval by the Academic Policies Committee (undergraduate) or the Graduate Studies Committee (graduate), a vote by the full-time faculty, and the approval of the Administrative Cabinet. The faculty should work closely with the appropriate committees throughout the Program Review process. If the Academic Unit is considering a new program or new degree, a WASC substantive change proposal may be required. In such cases PLNU’s Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) will provide assistance to the faculty in preparing the substantive change proposal based on the analysis gathered through the program review process. These proposals will be drafted in the WASC Substantive change format addressing the specific questions appropriate for a new program or new degree level.

|  |
| --- |
| PART IV – Core Commitment to Quality and Continuous Improvement |

*Institutions are committed to high standards of quality in all of their educational activities. They utilize appropriate evidence to improve teaching, learning, and overall institutional effectiveness. Through strategic and integrated planning, institutions demonstrate the capacity to fulfill their current commitments and future needs and opportunities.*

***WASC Handbook of Accreditation*, March 2013, p. 6**

The Program Review process includes a comparison to other nationally recognized programs of similar size, purpose and discipline and to national standards in the specific disciplines The Academic Unit should compare curriculum, support activities and services, learning outcomes, and student research opportunities. The comparative analysis should identify ways to enhance the program to better support the student learning outcomes.

**ISSUES TO ADDRESS**

1. **Comparison with comparable programs at comparator and aspirant programs at other universities:** Describe the most important similarities and differences between your program and three to five programs at other institutions with similar and highly regarded programs. Identify appropriate national benchmarks for comparison (e.g., Educational Benchmarking, Inc., ETS Major Field Test).
2. **Best Practices in the Discipline(s):** Identify at least three issues, problems, or challenges your program is facing for which it is possible to identify “best practices” in the discipline. Describe those “best practices” and how they can inform your own program improvement efforts (Best practices do not have to be drawn from comparator or aspirant universities.).
3. **Unique Features:** Describe any unique features of your program that strengthen its comparative position or represent best practice within the discipline.

|  |
| --- |
| PART V – Internal Strengths-Weaknesses and External Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) Analysis |

SWOT analysis focuses on the “fit” between the internal capability (strengths & weaknesses) of the academic unit and the changing context of the external situation (opportunities & threats). Summarize the internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats of the program based on the program review process. Prioritize each based on the future goals of the academic unit. Discuss the gaps between current and desired performance, resources, academic quality, and program viability. Identify ways to close or mitigate the gaps in current program with the existing resources.

**ISSUES TO ADDRESS**

1. **Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 9)**

This is a summary of the internal academic unit strengths and weaknesses of the program(s) as well as the benefits to the university for retaining, building or redesigning the program(s). What are the identified strengths of the program(s)? Will these strengths continue into the foreseeable future? How does the program contribute to the mission and add value to the university? Does the program serve the community, students, or university in unique ways?

What specific weaknesses were identified in the program review? How will the academic unit address these weaknesses? How threatening are these weaknesses to the future viability of the program(s)? Will the academic unit mitigate or eliminate the programs vulnerability to future challenges?

**Internal Capability (current situation analysis)**

* Strength – is a valuable distinctive of the program or academic unit. A strength might include faculty expertise, a national grant, community network for jobs and internships, diversity of student population, student learning, or achievements (e.g., professional accreditation) that place the academic unit in a strong position. A strength can also reflect alliances with other universities, outside organizations (e.g. BioLogos, San Diego Zoo Biomimicry).
* Weakness – is something the academic unit lacks or does poorly in comparison to others or a condition that puts them at a disadvantage (e.g., lack of lab space and inadequate facilities). Examples of weaknesses in an academic unit might include: lack of administrative or managerial skills and talent, too wide or narrow course offerings, poor facilities, weak image among colleagues in the discipline, declining enrollment, no clear direction, and outdated programs.

1. **Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 10)**

This section focuses on the opportunities and threats external to the University (e.g. professional development program, new degree program or modality, grant, declining market, etc.). What are the best ideas that surfaced about future innovation of the program(s) to strengthen the program to meet future direction of the academic field? Is the program(s) preparing students for the new realities in terms of their profession, job market, graduate school or research?

What external threats were identified to the program(s) that might question the sustainability of the program(s) over the long term? How immediate or strong are these threats? Are there ways to minimize the impact on the program(s)?

**External Situations (future direction and vision)**

* Opportunities – are those situations that offer the academic unit pathways to growth, innovation, and program development. Opportunities may include ability to attract new student population, offer innovative new emerging programs in the discipline, new partnerships with high profile partners.
* Threats – are those areas external to the university and academic unit that threaten the survival of a program or academic unit. Examples of threats include: downturn in the economy in a particular employment sector (e.g. layoff of teachers), less expensive alternative programs, changes in federal or state regulations, other universities that become relatively more attractive, and changing demographics of student population.

|  |
| --- |
| PART VI - Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry |

Based on the current program review and analysis, discuss future lines of inquiry the academic unit may want to pursue for continuous improvement of the program. These may include questions or concerns the academic unit would like to pursue or issues on which the academic unit wishes to receive guidance from external reviewers, Program Review Committee, Provost or others. Such future lines of inquiry might include a revision to mission, learning outcomes, goals, distance education, grant opportunities, revised assessment plan, new degree program, a new academic center, etc.

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix F: External Review Team Procedure and Letter of Agreement |

External Review Team Guidelines

The external review typically occurs two or three months after the academic unit submits its self-study to the Program Review Committee. The Committee works with program faculty and the College Dean to identify an External Review Team. The External Review Team may include individuals from PLNU, but outside the program being reviewed, as well as at least two reviewers from outside PLNU. The review team should be comprised of 3 to 4 individuals with appropriate expertise in the academic field under review or in the program review process. The College Dean receives the recommendation of the Program Review Committee and makes the final approval regarding the External Review Team membership. The External Review Team members should receive the Self-Study and supporting documents a minimum of a month before the visit.

External Review Team members have the following characteristics:

* A terminal degree in the discipline being reviewed, strong academic credentials, and administrative experience;
* Prior experience in conducting academic program review;
* Leadership in the discipline based on publications, executive position with professional organization, or other recognized basis of expertise;
* Professional work at a university similar in mission and enrollment to PLNU or at a nationally recognized similar program;
* Experience in curriculum development and assessment;
* **No affiliation with the program under review nor should they have past connections such as a program graduate or former faculty.**

The academic unit is expected to make External Review Team nominations with accompanying curriculum vitae, and rationale for the recommendation to the Program Review Committee. The Committee in turn reviews the nominations and submits a recommendation to the College Dean. Once the College Dean has determined who will be invited to serve on the External Review Team, the College Dean composes a Letter of Agreement (LOA sample is available, Appendix F) and the Provost will extend the invitations to the review team members. The academic unit, with the assistance of the Office for Institutional Effectiveness, arranges the logistics for the visit: the delivery of all written materials to the external reviewers, administrative support, assistance with travel plans and hotel reservations, payment or reimbursement of expenses, including arrangements with the business office for the external reviewer’s stipend (typically $500 to $1000 per person, plus expenses). The academic unit may also want to consider a stipend (e.g. $100 to $250 per person) for the internal PLNU team members.

External Reviewers’ Tasks

The external reviewers provide insight on programs from the objective perspective of the outside expert in program content. The team’s written critique, when combined with the academic

unit’s self-study and Program Review Committee’s analysis provides a thorough and credible review of the quality and effectiveness of the program, services, resources, and operations. To facilitate the process the reviewers are asked a series of questions that have surfaced during the Self-Study and are areas of particular interest to the university.

Questions may include:

* Are the courses content, program course sequence, and faculty knowledge and experience cover the current knowledge and best practices in the field?
* Are the faculty experiences, CVs, and qualifications demonstrating the appropriate range required for the program being offered?
* Does the curriculum demonstrate the appropriate rigor for an undergraduate or graduate level of instruction?
* Are students being offered the appropriate services and academic experiences for the program?
* Do assessments align with program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes?
* Is the academic unit’s assessment plan appropriate for the program and does it yield excellent assessment data to guide program improvements?
* Are the assessment data appropriately measured, collected, reviewed, analyzed and used for continuous program improvements?
* What do students, alumni, and the advisory council say about the quality and rigor of the program?

The External Review Team is provided a copy of the program review self-study and the Program Review Guidelines at least a month in advance of the team’s visit with the academic unit (WASC recommends 30 days prior to scheduled visit). During the interviews the academic unit provides the Team access to department faculty, staff, students, alumni, academic advisors, program coordinators, appropriate administrators, and the Program Review Committee. It is recommended that the academic unit provide the team a virtual or physical exhibit room of student accomplishments and assessment documents. The academic unit will provide any additional information requested by the team and supports the team’s logistical arrangements.

External reviewers focus their analysis on three primary areas: curriculum, assessment of learning outcomes, and the student educational experience. Before the visit the team meets via teleconference and selects a team leader and a recorder, divides assignments, and plans the visit. The External Review Team’s visit includes meetings with the program faculty, students, alumni, administrators, members of the Program Review Committee, and College Dean. A review team’s visit will take two to three days and end with an exit interview with the Provost where the External Review Team presents the Provost a report of their findings, commendations, and recommendation the academic unit under review is provided a copy of the External Review Team’s report and given the opportunity to write a unit response addressing any factual errors or misperceptions and, if appropriate, incorporate the findings or recommendations in a revised report to the Program Review Committee.

According to WASC, “The review team visit typically lasts for two days, during which time the review committee members meet with department faculty, academic advisors, students, the campus program review committee, and select administrators. The review team typically takes part in an exit interview just prior to concluding its departmental visit and is expected to submit its written evaluation to the Provost prior to departure and at the conclusion of the visit. Upon submission of the report, the off-campus reviewers generally receive a stipend and travel expense reimbursement.” (*WASC Resource Guide for ‘Good Practices’ in Academic Program Review*, September 2009, p. 13)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample Itinerary for External Review Team** | | | |
| **Time** | | **Responsible for arrangements** | **Description** |
| Prior to visit | | Academic Unit , assistance from Office of IE | Teleconference with Academic Unit leadership and the External Review Team members |
| **Day 1** |  |  |  |
| 8:00 am | Academic Unit | Breakfast with the College Dean, Department Chair, Program Review Committee liaison |
| 9:00 am | Academic Unit | Tour campus including program facilities |
| 9:30 am | Academic Unit | Review program exhibits including student work |
| 10:00 am | Academic Unit | Meet with program faculty |
| 11:00 am | Academic Unit | Observe class session |
| 12:00 noon | Academic Unit | Lunch with students |
| 1:30pm | Academic Unit | Discussion with honors students and alumni |
| 2:30pm | Academic Unit | Guest lecture by external reviewer |
| 4:00pm | Academic Unit | External Reviewers meet in consultation |
| Evening | Academic Unit | Dinner with department chair/ dean, faculty, alumni |
| **Day 2** |  |  |  |
| 7:30am | Office of Institutional Effectiveness | Breakfast with President, Provost, and College Dean |
| 9:00am | Office of IE | Meeting with Program Review Committee members |
| 10:00am | Office of IE | Meeting with Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Vice Provost for Academic Administration, Institutional Effectiveness Committee |
|  | 11:00am | Office of IE | Report writing begins and concludes before departure |
|  | Noon | Office of IE | Box lunch provided |
|  | Afternoon | Office of IE | Report writing continues |
|  | Prior to departure | Office of IE | Meet with the Provost to deliver External Review Team report |

|  |
| --- |
| **Letter of Agreement with the External Review Team members** |
| Dear \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_;  Thank you for serving on the Program Review External Review Team for Point Loma Nazarene University’s (school/ department). The Program Review process is among the most important measures of academic quality and educational effectiveness. The Program Review is central to the continuous improvement of the University’s academic programs, resource allocation and strategic prioritization.  As a member of the External Review Team you will be given an honorarium of \_\_\_\_\_\_ for your service and provided administrative and logistic support for your visit including travel arrangements, hotel, and meals. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will serve as your point of contact for all arrangements during your site visit.  A month prior to your visit you will be provided a copy of the Academic Unit’s Self-Study, program related data, Program Review Handbook, and any additional materials deemed appropriate for your visit. You are also asked to participate in a **pre-visit conference call** with the Academic Unit’s faculty and other External Review Team members to discuss the visit process and make preparations. During the site visit you will meet with faculty, staff, students, alumni, Program Review Committee and senior administrators. In addition, the Program faculty will exchange questions with the Review Team that addresses specific areas of concern. Other issues the External Review Team may want to consider:   * Are the course syllabi current and adequately cover the current knowledge in the field * Do the faculty have the appropriate qualifications and expertise * Does the curriculum demonstrate the appropriate rigor, quality and instruction for the graduate/ undergraduate level * Are the annual assessments assignments appropriate and aligned with the Students Learning Outcomes * Are the programs benchmarked to comparable and aspirant programs and national standards * Does the program represent Best Practices in the field of expertise   The External Review Team is asked to write a report at the conclusion of the site visit and present this to the Provost prior to departure. The Team’s report provides analysis of the quality and effectiveness of the programs, services, resources, and objectives of the programs under examination. The report should include three sections:   1. Executive Summary with their findings regarding questions posed during the process 2. Commendations about what the program is doing well 3. Recommendations for future direction, program improvements, resources, services, etc.   In order for there to be complete candidness during the visit, it is asked that every member of the External Review Team adheres to strict confidentiality. This confidentiality agreement includes anyone outside Point Loma Nazarene University and using your findings for research publications or other purposes deemed inappropriate by the University’s Provost.  If the External Review Team learns of any allegations of misconduct, harassment, falsification of records, the team is asked to report this to the senior administrators who will in turn take the appropriate actions.  If you agree with these terms, please sign and date the agreement and fax or scan back to the Office of the Provost, Dr. Kerry Fulcher (619-849-2651 or [KerryFulcher@pointloma.edu](mailto:KerryFulcher@pointloma.edu)).  Sincerely,  Dr. Kerry Fulcher  ***Provost and Chief Academic Officer***  Point Loma Nazarene University \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  3900 Lomaland Drive Signature  San Diego, CA 92106  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Cc: Program Review Committee Date  College Dean  Dean/ Chair Academic Unit |

|  |
| --- |
| **EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM REPORT** |
| 1. **Executive Summary and Findings**    1. Provide a brief executive summary of major findings for this program.    2. General observations and comments on the program and curriculum, quality of student learning and the achievement of student learning outcomes, the annual assessment plan, faculty, students, facilities and resources.    3. Summary of responses to questions posed by faculty, students and administrators. 2. **Commendations**    1. Identify those things the program is doing well including curriculum, assessment, student’s educational experience.    2. Discuss the services provided to students that enhance their educational experience. 3. **Recommendations**    1. Provide comments to guide future direction for faculty to use to improve student learning. Provide evaluative feedback that would improve the program and recommendations. The report will specifically include examples of similar programs at other universities that can be used as exemplars.    2. Educational effectiveness topics may include the following: suggest improvements in specific learning outcomes, analyze/evaluate direct and indirect evidence of student learning, offer suggestions to improve assessment process, evaluate assessment plan, and evaluate the process for continuous program improvement. |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix G - Memorandum of Understanding (including an action plan) |

Many universities use a Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) to formalize an agreement between the academic unit and the Institution. The Memorandum of Understanding is not required by WASC but is considered among “best practices” and an effective way to build mechanisms for accountability for the desired outcomes and a time line. The MOU is linked to future budgeting, planning and resource allocation as well as a program improvement time line. The MOU contains three parts: (1) summary of academic unit and program improvements needed, (2) the action plan for the academic unit to improve the program with specific targets, and (3) a commitment from the University to provide resources, support, and faculty to achieve the agreed upon student learning outcomes.

The MOU (3 to 5 pages) with the academic action plan (2 to 3 pages) is drafted by the academic unit leadership and College Dean in consultation with the Provost and serves as an agreement between the academic unit and Institution. The MOU outlines the program improvement actions the academic unit is required to fulfill within a designated time frame and the Institution’s commitment, including the allocation of resources, to support the program improvement process. When finalized the MOU may include an agreement to improve assessment measures, realignment of curriculum, the addition or elimination of a major or minor, shift in faculty load or reallocation of resources, etc. In most cases the academic unit leadership will be tasked to provide an annual report update of their progress on achieving the program improvements. The Provost will present the MOU to the Cabinet for their review and comment. Once the Cabinet has reviewed and approved the MOU, the Provost will sign the MOU on behalf of the Cabinet and provide the academic unit with the final copy to be signed by the chair or dean of the academic unit and the College Dean.

The MOU should include the following parts:

**Vision for the future:** Describe what the academic unit wants to achieve during the next program review cycle (6 years). Address any changes to the academic unit vision, mission and core values that occur as a result of the program review process and self-study. This vision should guide the academic unit in its program improvements and enhancements.

**Improvements using current resources:** Describe the gaps between current and desired performance and specific actions the academic unit can take immediately to improve the program. This should include a specific implementation plan with target dates. Discuss how current resources will be reallocated to implement these action steps. Summarize the academic unit’s assessment plan to evaluate the changes.

**Improvements with new resources:** Describe the gaps between current and desired performance and specific options the academic unit will take to close performance gaps that will require new resources. Explain what additional resources are required for each specific action and how the academic unit envisions these new resources are generated. Explain what specific new resources the academic unit is requesting from the University. The MOU should include a proposed budget and evidence of student demand for the program.

|  |
| --- |
| ***PART 1 - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)* Template**  (3 to 5 pages)  This template is provided to the academic unit, Program Review Committee, and Provost in developing a Memorandum of Understanding between the academic unit and Institution. The MOU includes signatures of the dean or chair of the academic unit, College Dean, Program Review Committee liaison, and Provost. The MOU may include the following elements:   1. Executive summary of the changes required for program improvement 2. Commendations for those involved in the program review process 3. Action plan made up of specific steps to improve the program along learning outcomes or elements of the program (see template on following page)    1. Learning Outcomes: changes in PLOs, SLOs, assessment plan, measurements, etc.    2. Curriculum and pedagogy: changes in majors, minors, courses, etc.    3. Interdisciplinary collaboration with other departments and/or schools    4. Faculty: identification of faculty needs or changes    5. Students: changes in student support services    6. Resources: proposal for different or new resources 4. Provost Statement    1. Responding to the University mission    2. Program viability and sustainability    3. Cost cutting requirements    4. Efficiencies in course offerings needed    5. Discussion about resource allocation and capital improvements    6. Expected program improvements 5. Resourcing and Institutional support plan    1. Any budget implications    2. Capital improvements including facility, equipment and furniture    3. Additional faculty and staff resources 6. Signature page |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part 2 - Quality Improvement Action Plan**  Department Name  (2 to 3 pages)  *(Adapted from California State University–Fresno resources)* |
| **Vision, Purpose Statement, Core Values:** Enter any recommended changes and alignment with Institution. |
| **Specific actions to be taken to achieve desired change (in order of priority):**   * **Gap:** describe the gap in current performance and desired performance followed by action to be taken to improve performance (a single gap may involve more than one action). * **Action 1**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   1. Enter expected outcome and its alignment with the organizational goals and vision   2. Enter cost and resource implications   3. Enter source of funds/resources   4. Enter benchmark and time line for action   5. Enter communication path/approval route for action # 1 to be implemented   6. Enter requirements and responsibility for implementation |
| **Specific actions to be taken to achieve desired change (in order of priority):**   * **Gap:** describe the gap in current performance and desired performance followed by action to be taken to improve performance (a single gap may involve more than one action). * **Action 2**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_   1. Enter expected outcome and its alignment with the organizational goals and vision   2. Enter cost and resource implications   3. Enter source of funds/resources   4. Enter benchmark and time line for action   5. Enter communication path/approval route for action # 1 to be implemented   6. Enter requirements and responsibility for implementation |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix H – Evaluation of the Program Review Process |

**Section I**: Please read the following statements that ask you to evaluate various aspects of the program review process on a scale of 1 to 7. Circle the number on each statement that best reflects your response. Below each subsection are blank lines that you can use to share any other comments of which you would like us to be aware. *This is an anonymous questionnaire so please do not write your name on it.*

Key: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat Disagree;

4 = Neutral or Don’t Know; 5 = Somewhat Agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly Agree

Strongly Strongly

Disagree Agree

--------------------------------------------

**Preparation**

1. The External Review Report was an important component of

our Review process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. We had all of the assessment elements completed, including

PLOs, curriculum map, signature assignments, rubrics

and assessment plan before our Program Review 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. The support provided by the Office of Institutional

Effectiveness/Research made an important contribution

to our Review process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. The support provided by the Program Review Committee

made an important contribution to our Review process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. The support provided by our Program Review liaison

made an important contribution to our Review process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Additional comments about preparation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strongly Strongly

Disagree Agree

--------------------------------------------

**Participation**

1. All of the faculty in our department carried an equal part of

the Program Review workload. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. All of the faculty in our department made important

contributions to our Review. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. All of the faculty in our department recognize the value

of Program Review. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. Personally, I understood the goals of Program Review. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Personally, I understood the procedures for Program Review. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Additional comments about participation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Outcomes**

1. I am confident that our Program Review will lead to

improved student learning. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. We have recommended significant changes to improve

student learning as a result of our Review. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. As a whole, our department was satisfied with the

Program Review process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. As a whole, our department was satisfied with the

Program Review outcomes. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. Personally, I was satisfied with the Review process. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. Personally, I was satisfied with our Program Review

outcomes. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Additional comments about outcomes: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Section II: Please indicate an overall evaluation of your Program Review experience by placing an “X” closest to the word in each pair that best expresses your opinion:**

1. *Important \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ Trivial*
2. Worthless \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ Valuable
3. *Useful \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ Waste of time*
4. Meaningless \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ Essential

1. *Excellent \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ Needs Improvement*

Additional comments about your overall experience:  
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Section III**: Although this questionnaire is anonymous, demographic information can be helpful in analyzing patterns and trends in more detail. These data will be used in the aggregate only and will not be used to identify any individual. Please check the relevant item in each case.

19. What is your sex (check one): \_\_\_\_\_Female \_\_\_\_\_Male

20. Please indicate your approximate age (check one): \_\_\_\_\_39 or below \_\_\_\_\_40-55 \_\_\_\_\_56 or above

What is the nature of your assignment?

1. Are you \_\_\_\_ full-time faculty or \_\_\_\_ adjunct? (check one)
2. If you are full-time, what is your rank: (check one)

\_\_\_\_ (Full) Professor \_\_\_\_ Associate Professor \_\_\_\_ Assistant Professor

***Thank you for providing us with your observations!***

|  |
| --- |
| APPENDIX I - TEMPLATES |

**Appendix I (1): BUDGET TO COVER THE COSTS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW**

The Academic Unit needs to prepare a proposed budget for the program review process. The budget should include any requirement for student assistant, expenses related to the External Review Team including stipends, costs of additional assessment tools such as surveys, increased administrative costs, travel, meals, and entertainment. All approved program review related costs are charged to the Institutional Effectiveness cost center 10–5310.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Review Proposed Budget**  **Academic Unit: ----------------------------** | | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Comment** |
|  |  |  |
| Account | Cost Center: 10-5310 |  |  |  |
| 6312 | Honorariums/Stipends |  |  |  |
| 6316 | Printing (Off- Campus) |  |  |  |
| 6318 | Photo/ Graphic Service |  |  |  |
| 6320 | Other Services |  |  |  |
| 6404 | Supplies |  |  |  |
| 6406 | Postage |  |  |  |
| 6704 | Travel, Meals, Lodging |  |  |  |
| 6705 | Local Meals & Entertainment |  |  |  |
| 6706 | Workshop Seminars |  |  |  |
| 6708 | Travel, Auto, Air |  |  |  |
| 6710 | Other Expenses |  |  |  |
| 6711 | Contingency |  |  |  |
| 6760 | Special Department |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total Costs** | $ - | $ - | $ - |

*Program review budget approval process*: Consult with your College Dean and the Program Review Committee about the program review budget. The expense plans are reviewed and approved by the Provost based on the recommendation of the College Dean and Program Review Committee. Once approved, the Academic Unit can follow the plan. To be assured of reimbursement, all expenses above the approved budget must have prior approval of the Provost.

*Program Review Sample Budget*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Review Sample Budget**  **Academic Unit: Astronomy** | | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Comment** |
| 2013 | 2014 |  |
| Account | Cost Center: 10-5310 |  |  |  |
| 6312 | Honorariums/ stipends |  | $ 1,900.00 | External reviewer honorarium $750, two external reviewers from off campus and $200, two PLNU reviewers. |
| 6404 | Supplies | $ 100.00 | $ 100.00 |  |
| 6704 | Travel, Meals, Lodging |  | $ 450.00 | Out-of-town reviewer, two nights $300, and Southern California reviewer, one night $150. |
| 6705 | Local Meals & Entertainment | $ 450.00 | $ 950.00 | Department monthly working lunches (brown bag) $50 per month x 9 months = $450 per annum. Reviewer meals ($ 100/ reviewer) and entertainment $300 while in town. |
| 6708 | Travel, Auto, Air |  | $ 625.00 | External reviewer flight to San Diego $ 500. Southern California reviewer $ 125 mileage reimbursement. |
| 6710 | Other Expenses | $ 500.00 | $ 500.00 | Additional administrative costs $250 per semester. |
| 6711 | Contingency |  |  |  |
| 6804 | Department Charge (Copier) | $ 250.00 | $ 250.00 | Additional copier charges |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total Costs** | $ 1,300.00 | $ 4,775.00 | **$ 6,075.00** |

Submitted by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Academic Unit Chair

Reviewed by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

College Dean

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Provost

**Appendix I (2):** **SUGGESTED TWO-YEAR SCHEDULE FOR A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM REVIEW**

Program Review’s Suggested Schedule Time Line and Budget

The Program Review process begins in the fall term and typically ends no later than spring of the following academic year. The spring semester before the beginning of the Program Review, the academic unit leadership meets with the Program Review Committee to discuss the process. At that time the academic unit submits a proposed schedule with time line to the Program Review Committee. The academic unit faculty also meet with the Director of Institutional Research to discuss the program review data package and define data needs for the program review.

The program review may take longer than anticipated. Based on the needs of the Academic Unit, its faculty may petition the Provost for an extension. The Program Review Committee considers the appropriateness of an extension and the implications of the delay. The Provost makes the final decisions on all extension appeals. Throughout the process the academic Program Review Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness works with the faculty to guide them through the process.

**Program Review Suggested Schedule Time Line (2-year)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Review** | **Semester** | **Scheduled Activities** |
| **Pre-Program Review prepara-tion** | **Spring** | * Office of Institutional Research sends a standardized data packet to academic unit dean/ chair and the Program Review Committee * Academic unit and Program Review Committee meet to discuss a Program Review schedule and budget (the Provost is the final approving authority) * Prepare for the IE Committee Review of assessment planning and practices |
|  | **Summer** | * Summer reflection on assessment and data |
| **Year 1** | **Fall** | * Academic unit resolves any questions about the scope, content, and budget of the process with the Program Review Committee and the Provost * Academic unit designs a Self-Study plan including faculty & staff assignments and analysis * Academic unit addresses the mission or purpose statement and its alignment to the university mission and institutional learning outcomes * Academic unit examines the 6 years of departmental assessment data * Academic unit provides to its Program Review liaison an update on the progress made based on the recommendations from the previous program review cycle * Academic unit identifies the lines of inquiry for the current program review: the ideas can include studying existing programs, investigating specific areas of concern or researching new ideas |
|  | **Spring** | * Self-Study continues with updates to Program Review Committee liaison * Academic unit recommends to the Program Review Committee an External Review Team * College Dean decides on composition of the External Review Team |
|  | **Summer** | * Self-Study continues |
| **Year 2** | **Fall** | * Academic unit submits Self-Study with proposed action plan to the Program Review Committee, including a projected three-year academic unit annual budget, supporting documentation, new program start-up costs, including faculty resource plan with implications * Program Review Committee provides feedback to academic unit * Revised Self-Study is provided to the External Review Team no less than a month prior to the visit * External Review Team is invited to campus (late fall or early spring) and the visit is followed by a report of findings and is submitted to the Provost and academic unit |
|  | **Spring** | * Program Review Committee and academic unit meet to discuss *Self-Study* and *External Review Team’s Report* and *PRC preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report* * Academic unit responds to *External Review Team’s Report* and *PRC preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report* and resolve issues with *Self-Study* * Academic unit revises action plan. Program Review Committee receives the revised *Self-Study* that includes the *Quality Improvement Action Plan*, and the Committee votes to accept or require additional action * Program Review Committee submits *Self-Study* with action plan, external reviewers report, and PRC’s Final *Findings and Recommendations* to the Provost * Provost, College Dean and academic unit develop the MOU |
|  | **Summer** | * Academic unit develops APC/GSC proposals for academic and program revisions to be submitted in the fall semester |

**Appendix I (3) - PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This template is to aid the Program Review Committee in developing its final report for the academic unit faculty and Provost to summarize the completion of the program review cycle. This report is in response to the program review self-study, External Review Team’s report, and academic unit response to External Review Team’s report.

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Review Committee**  ***Findings and Recommendations* (Template)** |
| The Program Review Committee *Findings and Recommendations* will include one of the following: (1) recommend to the Provost the approval of the Program Review without conditions, (2) recommend to the Provost approval of the program review with conditions, or (3) recommend to the Provost disapproval of the program review with recommendations for revisions and resubmission. Disapproval of a program review is extremely rare and signals to the academic leadership and Administrative Cabinet that changes should be considered in the academic program or leadership.  The academic unit’s comments on the Program Review Committee’s *preliminary Findings and Recommendation* report should be completed within a reasonable time frame but not to exceed one month. After receiving the academic unit’s response to the Program Review Committee’s preliminary findings, the Program Review Committee writes a final version of the Findings and Recommendations Report.   1. Executive summary 2. General observations    1. Discussion regarding academic unit’s program review based on the completed program review rubric    2. Comments on the program and curriculum, quality of learning outcomes, the assessment plans, achievement of students and faculty, facilities and resources 3. Recognition to the academic unit for specific accomplishments and areas of excellence 4. Recommendation that would improve any aspect of the program 5. Prioritization of recommendations for University action 6. Areas requiring further analysis |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **APPENDIX J - POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY RUBRIC** | | | | | |
| **INTRODUCTION** | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| **Previous PR Recommendations and/or Action Plan** | Completely addressed and reflected on all items that had been previously identified. | Addresses and reflects on many but not all items that were previously identified. | Addresses and reflects on a few of the items from the previous program review | Does not address previous recommendations or action plan. |  |
| **Brief History, Program Development, and Expectations for the Program** | Addresses history and development of the academic unit including a description and complete analysis of enrollment trends, migration to and from major, retention & graduation rates. | Brief overview of the academic unit with a discussion of the IR data packet but does not demonstrate a thorough understanding of the trends and causes. | Addresses some of the history and trends including brief discussion of the IR data packet. | Does not provide a history or an analysis of trends |  |
| **PART I – DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES AND ENSURING STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| **Program Mission and Alignment** | Program has a clear and concise mission statement that is appropriate for the academic unit, and program clearly aligns with all of the following: PLNU mission, core values, learning outcomes and external disciplinary benchmarks. | Program has a clear mission statement that is appropriate for the academic unit, and program clearly aligns with at least two of the following: PLNU mission, core values, learning outcomes and external disciplinary benchmarks. | Program mission statement is either vague or inappropriate for the academic unit, and program aligns with no more than one of the following: PLNU mission, core values, learning outcomes and external disciplinary benchmarks. | Program mission is missing and program does not align with PLNU mission, core values, learning outcomes and external disciplinary benchmarks. |  |
| **Academic Unit’s Stretch Goals** | Thorough statement and discussion of program outcomes, and stretch goals, including the areas of teaching, scholarship, creativity, and civic engagement. The Study addresses the national and global changes in the disciplines. | Analysis and discussion of some of the trends in the discipline including goals, but does not include a challenging vision. | Analysis is weak, and provides a cursory view of the changes in the discipline, and does not include an analysis of the national and global trends. | Does not include an in-depth analysis of the trends in the discipline or stretch goals for the academic unit. |  |
| **PART II – CORE COMMITMENT TO INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY, SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY** | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| **Thoroughness of Analysis at the academic unit level and for each program and service** | The self-study includes an excellent analysis of the academic unit as a whole and each part including each academic program, center, institute, General Education (?), certificate(s)/ credential(s), and supporting programs and services. There are no gaps noted. | The self-study includes and adequate analysis of the academic unit as a whole and each part including each academic program, center, institute, GE, certificate/ credentials, and supporting programs and services. There are few gaps noted. | The self-study includes a basic analysis of the academic unit as a whole and only some but not all of the academic programs, center(s), GE certificate/ credentials, and supporting programs and services. There are significant gaps noted. | The self-study inadequately analyzes the academic unit as a whole and does not include an analysis of each academic program, center(s). GE, certificate, and supporting programs and services. |  |
| **Internal and External Demand for the Program(s)** | Excellent analysis of the trends and projections for both internal and external enrollment in the programs including majors, minors, GE and courses. Created a thoughtful and appropriate response to enrollment challenges and growth opportunities. | Analysis of the enrollment trends and projections for most majors, minors, GE and courses. Developed a response that gives some rationale for response to enrollment, but not clear that the response completely addresses the challenges and opportunities. | Basic analysis of the enrollment trends and projections but exhibits only a limited understanding of the challenges and opportunities. The analysis of the enrollment trends is does not clearly follow from the data. | Little analysis or understanding of the enrollment trends and the appropriate response to sustain the programs. |  |
| **Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program(s) (Course Profile)** | Well-developed and thorough analysis of the entire work flow demands and productivity of the academic unit, including faculty loads, advising, program design, high-impact practices, program evaluation, and feedback used for continuous program improvement. | Analysis of the academic unit’s work flow and productivity including a basic understanding of faculty loads, advising, and program design. Program evaluation is done but not always used for program improvement. | Basic analysis of the academic unit work flow and productivity, but not a clear or complete analysis leading to program improvement. | Limited analysis or understanding of the issues leading to academic unit productivity and program improvement. |  |
| **Financial Resources and Academic Unit Costs** | Financial analysis of faculty and goods and services costs; student credit-unit discussed and compared internally, and externally to comparator institutions. The budget discussion includes detailed revenues and expenditures for the program. | Financial analysis of faculty and goods and services costs; student credit-hour discussed and compared to other departments within the university. The budget discussion includes detailed revenues and expenditures for the program. | Financial analysis is presented in a very general format. | Financial analysis of the program is not included. |  |
| **Quality of Program Inputs and Processes (Faculty, Professional Development, Technology, Information and Technology Resources)** | A comprehensive analysis of Academic Unit and Program inputs and processes including faculty ratios, professional development, technology development and usage, information resources, support services such as advising, tutorial help and wellness and/or career counseling needed to support students appropriate to their degree and/or modality of delivery completed. | An adequate analysis of Academic Unit and Program inputs and processes including: training and development, support services such as advising, tutorial help and wellness and/or career counseling needed to support students appropriate to their degree and/or modality of delivery completed. | A minimal analysis of Academic Unit and Program inputs and processes, including faculty, and support services such as advising, tutorial help and wellness and/or career counseling needed to support students appropriate to their degree and/or modality of delivery completed. | Little or no analysis of Program inputs and processes: including faculty ratios, support services such as advising, tutorial help and wellness and/or career counseling needed to support students appropriate to their degree and/or modality of delivery completed. |  |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| **Infrastructure: Resource Profile, Facilities and Staff** | Exceptional in addressing the facilities, physical resources and in making a strong case for improvements where needed. | Adequately addresses academic unit facilities, resources, and makes a case for improvements. | Minimally addresses the facilities, resources, and staff and provides a basic plan for improvement. | Little or no analysis of physical resources and no plan for improvement. |  |
| **Student Profile** | Excellent analysis of the students (including major, minor and GE demographics): recruitment, graduation, retention, financial needs of students, skills, remediation, and academics. Includes a student success plan. | Adequate analysis of the student profile with an analysis of student needs and a basic student success plan. | Minimal review of the student profile with basic analysis of student needs and plan for success. | Little or no analysis of the student profile and understanding of the student needs. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART III – CORE COMMITMENT TO STUDENT LEARNING AND SUCCESS** | | | | | |
| **The following assessment criterion are Imported from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee** | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| ***Assessment Wheel (IE Committee Report and Score)*** | Excellent assessment program in all aspects with few areas needing improvement. | Strong assessment program with some areas needing further development. | Building of assessment program begun, but needs significant improvement. | Have made very little progress on building out the assessment structure for the program. |  |
| ***Score \_\_\_*** | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |  |
| ***Program Assessment (1…2…3…)***  ***A different criteria row for each of the academic programs*** | Excellent assessment documentation and evidence for Program (1) with few areas needing improvement. | Strong assessment documentation and evidence for Program (1) with few areas needing improvement. | Building of the assessment for Program (1) documentation and evidence has begun, but needs significant improvement. | Have made very little progress on building out the assessment structure and evidence for Program (1). |  |
| ***Score \_\_\_*** | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed** | | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| **Curriculum (Structure and Coherence of Instructional Program)** | Thorough and excellent analysis of the appropriateness, rigor, quality, currency, comprehensiveness of the curriculum and pedagogy including national discipline specific standards and program assessment. Includes an excellent plan for curriculum improvement and innovation. | | Adequate analysis of the curriculum, program design, pedagogy, discipline standards and program assessment. Includes an adequate plan for curriculum and program improvement. | Minimum analysis of the curriculum and program design, discipline standards, appropriate pedagogy. A basic plan for curriculum and program improvement. | Little or no analysis of the curriculum and program without a clear plan for improvement. |  |
| **Program Faculty** | Excellent description and analysis of the program faculty and how the faculty enhance the program’s mission, assessment of learning, and goals. Thorough analysis and plan for development of faculty effectiveness in teaching and learning. | | Adequate description and analysis of the program faculty and how they enhance the program, assessment of learning and program goals. Adequate analysis and plan for development of faculty effectiveness. | Minimum description and analysis of the program faculty and how they enhance the program. Analysis and plan do not clearly identify a faculty development plan for teaching effectiveness. | Little or no description or analysis of the program faculty and how they enhance the program. No or little plan for the development of faculty for improving teaching effectiveness. |  |
| **Compliance: Credit Hour, Core Competencies, and PLNU Policies** | Full, complete report and analysis of the program compliance processes to Federal, Accreditation and PLNU policies. | | Adequate report and discussion of the program compliance with Federal, Accreditation and PLNU policies. | Minimum discussion or reporting on the compliance with standards and policies. | Little or no discussion and reporting of compliance. |  |
| **Graduate Placement, Graduate School and Alumni Satisfaction** | Excellent analysis and data regarding post-graduation outcomes, including a well-developed alumni survey with a discussion on how data will be used for program improvement. | | Adequate analysis and data about post-graduation outcomes, including an alumni survey with analysis. | Minimal analysis and knowledge of post-graduation outcomes based on a basic alumni survey. | Little or no discussion or analysis of post-graduation and no alumni survey. |  |
| **External support: Advisory Council, Professional, Academic Guild Standards, and Community Engagement** | Excellent description and analysis of student opportunities for internships, employment placement, high impact practices, community engagement. The academic unit has a fully engaged Advisory Council including external stakeholders committed to program improvement. | | Adequate description and analysis of student opportunities and high impact practices. The academic unit has an Advisory Council that is engaged in advising the academic unit. | Minimal description with some analysis of student opportunities and high impact practices. The academic unit does not have an Advisory Council that is engaged in program improvement. | Little or no description or analysis of student program opportunities or high impact practices. The academic unit does not have an Advisory Council. |  |
| **Student Evaluation Feedback (Aggregate for Program…Not for Individual Professors)** | Exceptional student feedback on the quality of Instruction, the curriculum and academic advising is included and considered as part of Program Review. | | Adequate student feedback on the quality of Instruction, the curriculum and academic advising is included and considered as part of Program Review. | Minimal student feedback on the quality of Instruction, the curriculum and academic advising is included and considered as part of Program Review. | Key student feedback on the quality of Instruction, the curriculum and academic advising is not included or considered as part of Program Review. |  |
| **PART IV – CORE COMMITMENT TO QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | | **Highly Developed** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Initial** | **Comments** |
| **Comparator and Aspirant Programs, Best Practices in the Discipline, and Unique Features** | | Excellent selection rationale and analysis of comparator and aspirant universities. Best practices and unique features with comparative data of size, demographics, FTE, faculty ratios, and other metrics. | Adequate selection and analysis of comparator and aspirant schools with comparative metrics. | Minimal analysis of comparator and aspirant schools with insufficient metrics for adequate comparison. | Inadequate rationale and analysis of comparator and aspirant schools with insufficient or no metrics. |  |
| **Action Plan for Improvement** | | Action items exceptionally address the findings of the self-study and are appropriately placed in timeline for next six years. | Action items adequately address the findings of the self- study but may not be realistically planned or sequenced | Action items flow from findings but don't fully address findings | Action items are missing, or those identified do not flow from findings of the self-study |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART V – INTERNAL STRENGTHS-WEAKNESSES AND EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES-THREATS (SWOT ANALYSIS)** | | | | | | | |
|  | Internal Capability: Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)  (Internal to the Academic Unit) | Excellent analysis of the internal strengths and weaknesses of the academic unit and program(s) as well as the benefits to the university for retaining, building or redesigning the program(s). Identified ways to build on the strengths and how they will address or mitigate the program(s) weaknesses. | Adequate analysis of the internal strengths and weaknesses of the academic unit and program(s). Adequate discussion on the benefits of the academic unit and its program(s), to the University mission and makes a case for the value the academic unit and its program(s) provide the University. | Basic analysis of the internal strengths and weaknesses of the academic unit and program(s). Some discussion and basic understanding of the benefits of the program(s) to the University. Does not make a strong case for the value the academic unit and programs add to the University. | No analysis or understanding of the internal strengths and weaknesses of the program. Does not make a case for the value the academic unit and program(s) add to the University. | |  |
| **SW (internal)/ OT (external)** | External Situations (future direction and vision):  Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s)  (External to the University) | Identified innovative opportunities that will strengthen the program(s) future direction of the academic field and preparing students for the future. External threats were thoroughly identified and how these might -threaten the sustainability of the program(s). | Adequate discussion of ideas that will strengthen the program(s) and better prepare students for the future. Adequately addresses the external threats to the academic unit and program(s) and posits some ideas that may mitigate the threat. | Basic analysis of some of the threats and opportunities that may impact the future of the academic unit and program(s). Seems to have a basic understanding of how the external environment may provide opportunities and threats. | No analysis or understanding of the impact of the external environment on the future opportunities or threats of the program(s). | |  |
|  | Analysis Linking Strengths/ Weaknesses to Threats/ Opportunities | In-depth analysis matching the academic unit’s internal strengths and weaknesses with key external opportunities and threats | Analysis of some of the academic unit’s SW matched to some of the key external OT | Analysis of some of the academic unit’s SW but are not clearly linked to the external TO | No analysis provided | |  |
| **PART VI – PROGRAM REVIEW THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY** | | | | | | | |
| **Themes for Future Inquiry** | | Thorough analysis that leads to future lines of inquiry for continuous improvement. These future lines of inquiry have the potential of adding significant value to the student’s education and the academic unit. | Adequate analysis that leads to future lines of inquiry for continuous improvement. These future lines of inquiry have the potential of adding some value to the student’s education and the academic unit. | Analysis does not clearly lead to future lines of inquiry for continuous improvement. These future lines of inquiry have do not appear to add value to the student’s education and/or the academic unit. | | Future lines of inquiry are not included in the self-study. |  |
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GLOSSARY

**Academic Unit**

An academic unit is defined as a department or school whose mission is teaching and research and houses the academic degree programs. Point Loma Nazarene University has seventeen academic units. These include all academic departments (e.g. Psychology, Biology, Chemistry, etc.) and schools (e.g. Education, Business, Nursing, etc.).

**Accreditation**

Accreditation is a voluntary process involving an association of schools and/or colleges to encourage high standards of education. Accreditation indicates that the Commission judges that the institution, in a manner consistent with Commission standards, offers its students on a satisfactory level the educational opportunities implied in its objectives and is likely to continue to do so, ***WASC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation.***

**Accrediting Association (regional)**

Regional accreditation is a voluntary, non‐governmental association established to administer accrediting procedures and standards for universities but not specific academic programs. A listed accrediting body is one that is officially listed by the Secretary of Education because it is used as part of the Department of Education’s processes for determining institutional eligibility for certain federal funds. There are six senior college and university regional accreditation associations: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Our (PLNU) subdivision in WASC is the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities.

**Accrediting Association (specialized, professional)**

**Several PLNU academic programs also** adhere to specialized accreditation that certifies the professional standards and quality of the program. For example, the School of Education is required by the State of California to be accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and to meet these standards for credentialing programs. The Program Review Committee works with the academic units in coordinating the timing of the internal program review cycle and specialized accreditation reviews.

**Alignment (curriculum)**

Alignment means that curriculum is coherent; it has a common framework that provides linkages among curriculum, instruction/learning experiences and assessment. An example is a tool that facilitates an alignment to a curriculum map.

**Assessment Plan**

Each academic unit is required to have assessment plans for the academic programs it offers. A plan outlines the student learning outcomes and program objectives, the direct and indirect assessment methods used to demonstrate attainment of each outcome, a brief explanation of the assessment methods that includes an indication of which outcomes are addressed by each method, the intervals and semesters at which evidence is collected and reviewed, and the individual(s) responsible for the collection and review of the evidence.

**Capstone or Culminating Experience**

A capstone, or culminating experience, is generally located in a capstone course in the senior year of college. It consists of a learning experience, performance task, paper or project on a topic chosen by the student or by the instructor. In some majors the culminating experience consists of writing an academic paper with a literature review or completing an Honors Thesis. In other majors, the culminating experience may be a singing recital or an art exhibit. In the sciences, students may take a standardized test, e.g., the Biology field test, at the end of their last course in the program as their culminating experience.

**Goals**

*Program or Academic Unit goals* are broad statements of what an academic unit or program aims to achieve and they serve as guiding aims to achieve through Learning Outcomes.

*Course goals*are broad, general statements of what a course aims to achieve. *Example*: “This course will introduce students to design methods and quality art” or “This course will expose students to federal and state government requirements for personal privacy, search and seizure.”

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is chaired by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and reports to the President (or designee). It is comprised of twelve faculty and staff.

Major responsibilities:

1. Advise the Director of Institutional Effectiveness on issues related to institutional assessment.

2. Facilitate the assessment program for the university in order to support institutional effectiveness.

3. Provide support for academic, administrative, and co-curricular leaders in their work to review program objectives, means of assessment, criteria for assessment, results of assessment, and use of results.

4. Receive and review annual assessment reports from all institutional units.

5. Ensure that the institutional assessment program is linked to the university's strategic plan and the academic planning process.

**Learning Outcomes**

Learning outcomes are the end rather than the means.

* ***Student Learning Outcome (SLO) –***  description of what a student will be able to KNOW, UNDERSTAND or be able TO DO at the end of a course. SLOs answer the question, “How will the student be different as a result of taking your course?” The learning outcomes are “the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and habits of mind that students will take with them from learning experience” (Linda Suskie, **Assessing Student Learning**, 2009, p. 117).They may be stated in terms of expected knowledge, skills or attitudes. These outcomes must be consistent with the mission of the department, college, and university. (**Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education**, Allen, 2003).
* Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) – broad, over-arching learning outcomes that describe what our graduates should know, understand or be able to do.
* School or Department Learning Outcomes – academic units with multiple programs and different degree levels may define learning outcomes that align all of the programs with the desired outcomes of the academic unit.
* Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) – Learning outcomes at the program level. These outcomes are overarching learning outcomes that describe learning obtained across multiple courses in the curriculum. Program student learning outcomes are broad descriptions of what students will be able to know, what they will be able to do, or how they will think about the discipline or approach problem solving after they finish your program. Although these outcomes are broad and general, they must still be written in language that clearly implies a measurable behavior or quality of work. The PLOs are readily measured:

*Example:* “Students with an MS in Research and Evaluation will demonstrate proficiency in using statistical software to analyze large data sets.”

*Example* (GE Program Learning Outcomes): As a result of the GE program, “Students will demonstrate understanding of analysis, criticism, and advocacy in the context of deductive and inductive reasoning,” or “Students can perform computations and symbolic manipulations.”

* Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) – Statements of what students are expected to know, understand and be able to do by the time they complete the course. For students it may be easier to communicate the learning outcomes in language like: You will, instead of the student will—personalizing the learning for them. CLOs are more specific learning outcomes that identify learning in an individual course. Course LOs will be more detailed and specific than Program LOs because they describe the unique skills and knowledge associated with a specific course. However, they should be general enough to provide flexibility and accommodate variation in specific content as the field evolves over time. For example, a Course LO might state that student will be able to describe contemporary models and theories within a specialty area. Omission of the specific models and theories to be described allows an instructor to add newly-emerging theories and models without rewriting the CLOs for the course.

Course learning outcomes should be clearly related to course topics, assignments, exams, and other graded work.

**Mission or Statement of Purpose**

The Program’s mission, or statement of purpose, should provide an overview of the department/program’s philosophy, goals, and objectives. Basically, it should embody the program’s purpose and the faculty’s priorities for the program (**Allen, 2004).**

**Program (academic)**

The academic program is a set of courses, units and other requirements leading to an academic degree (e.g. M.B.A., B.S. Chemistry, B.A. Sociology, etc.).

**Program Review**

The Program Review process examines the effectiveness of an academic program. The *academic* program review process is applied to degree programs, stand‐alone minors, General Education, and academic centers and institutes. The process provides feedback to (a) the academic unit primarily responsible for the program, (b) the appropriate academic administrators, and (c) external units in the form of confirmation of the existence of the APR process and in the form of summaries of the outcomes.

**Program Review Committee**

The (Academic) Program Review Committee is comprised of five full-time faculty members and is chaired by the Provost (or designee). It provides oversight of the program review process and coordination with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

**Academic Program Review Committee’s Responsibilities**

* Review, update and implement the Program Review Guidelines.
* Maintain and oversee the academic and co-curricular program review calendars and processes.
* Provide support to the academic units going through Program Review.
* Provide evaluative feedback to academic units that have submitted Program Review documents.
* Communicate with the chairs of APC and GCS when a Program Review has been completed and Program Review documents are available for viewing.

**Stakeholder**

A stakeholder is anyone who has a vested interest in the outcome of the program or project. For example, the stakeholders of the University will include such diverse groups as the faculty, students, alumni, community groups, administration, and bondholders.

**Standards (accreditation)**

Accreditation standards are a level of accomplishment all students are expected to meet or exceed. Standards do not necessarily imply high quality learning; sometimes the level is a lowest common denominator. Nor do they imply complete standardization in a program; a common minimum level could be achieved by multiple pathways and demonstrated in various ways. *Examples*: carrying on a conversation about daily activities in a foreign language using correct grammar and comprehensible pronunciation; achieving a certain score on a standardized test (**Leskes, 2004).**

**Teach-Out Plan**

A Teach Out plan is required by WASC when an academic unit decides to close an educational degree program. The academic unit should consider the following options:

1. The institution teaches out currently enrolled students; no longer admits students to programs; and terminates the program, the operations of a branch campus, or the operations of an institution after students have graduated.

2. The institution enters into a contract for another institution or organization to teach-out the educational programs or program. Such a teach-out agreement requires Commission approval.

See <http://www.wascsenior.org/files/Teach_Out_Plans_and_Agreements_Policy.pdf> for specifics.

**Value added**

The increase in learning that occurs during a course, program, or undergraduate education. Can either focus on the individual student (how much better a student can write, for example, at the end than at the beginning) or on a cohort of students (whether senior papers demonstrate more sophisticated writing skills—in the aggregate—than freshmen papers). A baseline measurement is required for comparison.

**Glossary-5**

**Value-added vs. Absolute Learning Outcomes**

* **Value-added Learning Outcomes** – State that students will improve. Value-added learning outcomes describe the increase in learning that occurs during a course, program, or undergraduate education. These learning outcomes require a baseline measurement for comparison, such as a pre-test/post-test or a similar mechanism.
* **Absolute Learning Outcomes-** Absolute Learning Outcomes state that students will be competent, so pre/post test data analysis is not necessary.