

PLNU Program Review Template_03-24-15

PLNU Instructions & Resources

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 submitted electronically within LiveText**, (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.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE SELF-STUDY TEMPLATE:

- Please respond to each of the issues to address within each section
- Do not delete or change the order of any sections or issues to address
- Begin the title of each supporting artifact with Appendix A, Appendix B, etc.
- Please reference supporting attachments within the section narrative.
- The self-study should be **no more than 10,000 words**, not including attachments.
- **Attachments are preferred as .PDF**

REVIEWING YOUR SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT:




- Please review your assessment wheel against the Institutional Effectiveness Rubrics prior to submitting self-study report: [IE Rubric for Assessment Planning](#) and [IE Rubric for Assessment Activities](#)
- Please review your self-study document against the [Program Review Self-Study Rubric](#) before submitting it.

SUBMITTING YOUR SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT:

- Please notify Stephanie Lehman (StephanieLehman@pointloma.edu) once the document is ready for submission. She will review formatting, double check all hyperlinks, etc. prior to submitting document to the Program Review Committee.
- Your Program Review Self-Study document will be submitted within department's administrative account.

RESOURCES:

- For more information on Point Loma Nazarene University's Program Review policy and procedures, the current guidelines and appendices may be found here: [University Assessment Plan and Program Review](#)
- For assistance formatting LiveText submissions, please review the [LiveText Tutorial](#).

Attachments  [Program Review Rubric Self Study Eval 03.25.14.pdf](#), 
[2 Assessment Rubric for Activities v2013.pdf](#), 
[1 Assessment Rubric for Assessment Planning v2013.pdf](#)

Academic Unit's Self-Study Introduction

Introduction Issues to Address

1. Name of Academic Unit, Program(s), and Center(s): include graduate and undergraduate, undergraduate majors, minors and concentrations, etc.
2. 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.
3. Program Overview: 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.
4. Brief History, Development, and Expectations of the program (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criteria No. 1): Include a brief history of an academic unit and the evolution of program(s) within that unit. ~~Using the data set provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Accounting and Finance, and other evidence gathered, include a complete analysis of 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

Part I Issues to Address

1. Program Mission, Learning Outcomes (Program and course) and Institutional Alignment: Analyze the academic unit and/ or program's alignment with the University mission, core values, learning outcomes and external disciplinary benchmarks. Include how Program Learning and Course Learning Outcomes are mapped (curricular map) to signature assignments, indirect and direct assessment, and whether or not appropriate rubrics are in place for assessment.
2. Academic Unit's Stretch Goals: Include a statement and discussion of program outcomes and stretch goals, including the areas of teaching, scholarship, creativity, and civic engagement. This section addresses the national and global changes in discipline(s).

Part I: Key Findings

Summary of key finding from Part I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Objectives

Key Findings	Recommendations

Part II: Core Commitment to Institutional Integrity, Sustainability & Accountability

Part II Issues to Address

Full <DEPT> [2014-15](#) Data Packet from the Office of Institutional Research: [CMT PR Data Packet Trends](#)

1. Analysis at the academic unit level and for each program and service: Include an 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.
2. Internal demand for the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 3): Include analysis of the trends and projections for internal enrollment in the program including majors, minors, GE and courses as well as appropriate response to enrollment challenges and growth opportunities.
3. External demand for the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 2): Include analysis of the national and regional enrollment trends, the past five (5) year enrollment trend for majors and minors and retention and graduation rates.
4. Size, scope and productivity of the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 6): Include analysis of the productivity of the academic unit, including faculty loads, advising, program design, high-impact practices, program evaluation, and feedback used for continuous program improvement.
5. Financial analysis of faculty, program costs, and costs of services provided: include analysis of student credit-units compared internally and externally to comparator institutions. The budget analysis should include details of the revenues and expenditures for the program.
 - 5a. Revenue and other resources generated by the program (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 7): Include a review of the revenue trends (provided by the Office of Finance and Accounting), address additional sources of revenue in addition to tuition being generated such as grants, fundraising, and continuing education courses.
 - 5b. Costs and other expenses associated with the program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 8): Comment on the department's costs for the past three years (provided by the Office of Finance and Accounting). The analysis should also include additional information such as national benchmarks by major in terms of program costs and FTEs (Delaware Study).
6. Quality of program inputs and processes (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 4): In the categories below, include an 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.

6.a. Faculty Analysis: Discuss ratios of faculty teaching courses over past three years. Include proportion of faculty with terminal degrees, tenure, rank, length of time at PLNU, planned retirements in the near future, etc. Discuss how these ratios have changed over the past five years.

6.b. 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.

6.c. Professional Development / Travel Support: Comment on the adequacy and availability of institutional support and outside funding for professional development and travel.

6.d. 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.

6.e. 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.

6.f. 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).

6.g. Student Profile: Analysis of the students (including major, minor and GE demographics), recruitment, graduation, retention, financial needs of students, skills, remediation and academics.

Part II Key Findings

Summary of key findings from Part II: Core Commitment to Institutional Integrity, Sustainability and Accountability:

Key Findings	Recommendations

Part III: Core Commitment to Student Learning and Success

Part III Issues to Address (PROGRAM 1)

The following assessment criterion is imported from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (rubric score average on a four-point scale). To view the complete report, please see: [IE Committee Assessment Report <DEPT> <DATE OF REPORT>](#)

Criteria	Highly Developed (4)	Developed (3)	Emerging (2)	Initial (1)
Assessment Wheel (Assessment Committee Report & 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.
	Academic Unit Score:			
Program Assessment:	Excellent assessment documentation and evidence for Program with few areas needing improvement.	Strong assessment documentation and evidence for Program with few areas needing improvement.	Building of the assessment for Program documentation and evidence has begun, but needs significant improvement.	Have made very little progress on building out the assessment structure and evidence for Program.
	Program 1 Score:			

1. Quality of Program Learning Outcomes (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 5): Summarize the status of student learning in the program including discussion of program assessment activities, and actions taken in response to information gained from assessment. Should include 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.

2. Curriculum: Responses below should include analysis of the appropriateness, rigor, quality, currency, comprehensiveness of the curriculum and pedagogy, including national discipline-specific standards and program assessment. Also includes plan for curriculum improvement and innovation.

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

2.b. 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.

3. Program Faculty: Include description and analysis of the program faculty and how the faculty enhances the programs' mission, assessment of learning, and goals. This section should also include a thorough analysis and plan for development of faculty effectiveness in teaching and learning.

4. Compliance: Credit Hour, Core Competencies and PLNU Policies: Include full and complete report and analysis on 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.

5. Graduate placement, graduate school and alumni satisfaction: Include analysis supported by data regarding post-graduation outcomes, including a well-developed alumni survey. This section should also include a discussion on how data will be used for program improvement.

6. External support: Advisory council, professional, academic guild standards and community engagement: Describe and analyze student opportunities for internships, employment placement, 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. Discuss how the academic unit or each program has fully engaged an Advisory Council, including external stakeholders committed to program improvement.

7. Student Evaluation Feedback (Aggregate for Program - not for Individual Professors): Should include in-depth analysis of student feedback on the quality of instruction, the curriculum and academic advising, which is considered as part of Program Review.

Part III Key Findings

Summary of key findings from Part III: Core Commitment to Student Learning and Success:

Key Findings	Recommendations

Part IV: Core Commitment to Quality & Continuous Improvement

Part IV Issues to Address

1. **Comparator and Aspirant Programs:** Include selection rationale and analysis with comparable programs at comparator and aspirant 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). Include unique features with comparative data of size, demographics, FTE, faculty ratios and other metrics.
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.
4. **Action Plan for Improvement:** Address the findings of the self-study, linking key findings to appropriate active responses with action items placed in a six-year timeline. This will become part of the Memorandum of Understanding at the end of the Program Review process.

Part IV Key Findings

Summary of key findings from Part IV: Core Commitment to Quality and Continuous Improvement

Key Findings	Recommendations

Part V: Internal SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, External Opportunities & Threats) Analysis

Part V Issues to Address

1. **Internal Capability: Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program(s)** (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 9): Identify and analyze 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). Identify ways to build on the strengths and how they will address or mitigate the program(s) weaknesses.

2. External Situations (future direction and vision); Opportunity Analysis of the Program(s) (Dickeson Model, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Criterion No. 10): Identify and analyze the opportunities and threats external to the University (e.g. professional development program, new degree program or modality, grant, declining market, etc.). Identify innovative opportunities that will strengthen the program(s) future direction of the academic field and prepare students for the future. Identify external threats, and how these threats might threaten the sustainability of the program(s) should be fully examined.

3. 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.

Part V Key Findings

Summary of key findings from Part III: Core Commitment to Student Learning and Success:

Key Findings	Recommendations

Part VI: Program Review Themes for Future Inquiry

Part VI Issues to Address

1. Themes for Future Inquiry: Provide 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 to the academic unit.

Part VI Key Findings

Summary of key findings from Part III: Core Commitment to Student Learning and Success:

Key Findings	Recommendations