

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their contributions to 2001-02 Program Review

Dr. Paul Schollaert, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Robert Holkeboer, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research
Graduate Council
Dr. Marcia Dalbey, Interim Assistant Vice President for Extended Programs
Dr. Sally McCracken, President, Faculty Council
Faculty Council
Dr. Susan Moeller, former Director, Academic Budget and Operations
Joy Garrett, Director, Records and Registration
Sherry Winterson, Associate Director, Records and Registration
Chris Shell, Assistant Director, Records and Registration
Dr. Donald Bennion, Director, Academic Assessment
Dr. Betsy Morgan, Interim Department Head, Foreign Languages and Bilingual Studies
Dr. William Miller, Director, Course and Program Development
Dr. Mark Higbee, Interim Director, Honors Program
Dr. Elliot Bonem, Department of Psychology
Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming
Lynn Tilton, Director, Course and Catalog Maintenance
Donelle Goerlitz, Senior Program Analyst
Katrina Williams, College of Technology
Satako Motohara, Graduate Assistant
Susan Campbell, Administrative Secretary

and to the many others across campus who helped ensure the success of
2001-02 Program Review.

PREFACE

The *2001-02 Program Review Annual Report* provides a summary of the restructured program review process at Eastern Michigan University. After several years without program review, the process was revised and began again in Spring 2001.

The principal reason for Program Review at Eastern Michigan University is the continuous improvement of academic programming. Additionally, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), in their 2001 accreditation site visit, was particularly interested in program related assessment activities, which are enhanced by program review.

Reviews assume that every program can be improved and that it is the responsibility of faculty, programs, and departments to work collaboratively across campus. This cooperation ensures quality in academic programs and research activities, and drives the strategic planning initiatives developed by the University.

The Provost kicked off the Program Review process in an October 10, 2001 letter to faculty that formalized the criteria to be used in making decisions about programs. The criteria he established include program: quality, efficiency, productivity, effectiveness, and the contribution to the University mission. During the Roundtable Discussions, the Provost also highlighted indicators of academic program quality including markers of excellence, benchmarking, faculty contributions to program enrichment, assessment, and outcomes as themes to be addressed across programs.

The *2001-02 Program Review Annual Report* begins with an historical account of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University. The report moves through the steps taken to restructure and reinstate the process. It describes how this past year unfolded and the follow-up actions required of departments. The report culminates with a discussion of the transition to 2002-03 and a look to the future for Program Review at Eastern Michigan University.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the staff of Academic Programming for their leadership and hard work for the advancement of the Program Review process, especially Donelle Goerlitz, Senior Program Analyst. I also want to thank all of the faculty and departmental staff across campus, who worked diligently and put in long hours to ensure the success of Program Review, during this first year of reinstatement at Eastern Michigan University.

Michael Harris, Ph.D.
Associate Provost, Academic Affairs
Eastern Michigan University
November 2002

**2001-02
PROGRAM REVIEW
ANNUAL REPORT**

**OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
NOVEMBER 2002**

2001-02 PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTIONS

I. Program Review at EMU	5
II. Goals of Program Review	6
III. Program Review Process	7
IV. Insights and Process Adjustments	10
V. Conclusions	12
VI. 2002-2003 Program Review	15

APPENDICES

A	17
B	19
C	20
D	22

2001-2002 Program Review Annual Report

In preparation for the 2001 NCA visit, reinstatement of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University became a priority. The Associate Provost developed a draft Program Review Departmental Manual. After working closely with the leadership of the division and the Provost, Faculty Council unanimously approved the manual in spring 2001. A ten-year rotation was established that includes two cycles of program review for each department and culminates with a two-year period dedicated to the NCA accreditation preparation and on-site visit.

The purpose of this report is to review and describe the 2001-02 Program Review process, highlighting the successes, discussing the adjustments made along the way to streamline and enhance the process, and outline strategies to streamline the Program Review process in the future. This report also fulfills the directive of the Program Review Department Manual that a report be written annually discussing the above areas.

I. Program Review at EMU

Retrospective

Program Review was launched at Eastern Michigan University in 1981. The system was initially greeted with suspicion by faculty and academic department heads, because the University was facing major budget cutbacks and the future existence of Eastern Michigan University was questioned by the state legislature. That suspicion, coupled with the natural concern people have about something new, led to the production of Program Review documents based upon "program documentation" rather than "program evaluation." Many of the Program Review documents produced under this system, while lengthy, lacked focus. As a result, there was a general feeling that many of these documents were of little value in determining the goals of departments, or their success in accomplishing their academic goals.

In 1985, a new Program Review system was developed. This system employed the concept of "program evaluation." Each academic department was asked to state goals for each of its programs and evaluate success in meeting these goals. Departments were also asked to present a developmental plan, including required resources, for meeting these goals within three years. In most cases, department follow-up actions were required.

To improve the Program Review system, a Program Review Task Force was formed in 1988. Based on the task force's recommendations, a modified Program Review system was adopted in 1990. Following the implementation of the modified Program Review system, one hundred ninety-seven academic programs were reviewed. Sixty-nine programs (35%) were required to implement program changes and eleven were phased out. The focus of the required changes was on program improvement and related student learning, and not on the performance of individual faculty. As a result, the quality of most of the programs and their enrollments improved. In a few cases, programs remained on "Continuation with Specific Changes Required" or "Probation" status because of insufficient progress in the above areas.

In 1998, with changes in personnel in the Office of the Associate Provost, and the increased emphasis by Eastern Michigan University on formal assessments and specialized academic program accreditation, the Provost invoked a brief suspension of the Program Review process.

Restructuring the process

During the spring and summer of 2000, the Program Review system was revised. The Program Review Departmental Manual was rewritten to include guidelines for the identification of programs within a department, a description of the Program Review and the post-review process, and outlines for writing the Program Review report and the post-review report. The new schedule mandated separate reviews for all programs, both graduate and undergraduate, within a department in the same year, unless a department with multiple programs received permission from the Associate Provost to conduct reviews of programs in successive years. In the case of interdisciplinary programs, the department receiving student credit hour (SCH) credit was made responsible for preparing the Program Review, with the contributions by the other departments involved in the program. The responsibility for implementing and managing the Program Review process was assigned to the Associate Provost.

Refinement and approval of the manual

The Program Review Departmental Manual was rewritten to include guidelines for the identification of programs within a department, a description of the Program Review and post-review program process, and outlines for writing the Program Review report and the post-review program report. The Program Review Department Manual was submitted to Faculty Council for approval and after several modifications, was passed unanimously on April 4, 2001.

Department schedule

The department schedule was established in cooperation with the college deans. Accreditation site visits were a key issue considered. College deans were offered the option of going through Program Review either at the same time as an accreditation visit, or during an off year. The final schedule was determined based on the college deans' input (*Appendix A*).

The schedule is based on a ten-year cycle. During each of the first four years, one-quarter of the departments go through an initial round of Program Review. During the next four years, the cycle starts again with one-quarter of the departments going through a second round of Program Review. The last two years of the schedule allow for the NCA self-study in year nine, and the NCA site visit in year ten, after which the original ten year cycle resumes.

II. Goals of Program Review

Program Review at Eastern Michigan University is undertaken for the purpose of program improvement. The Division of Academic Affairs views Program Review as formative and constructive, rather than summative and judgmental. Reviews identify present strengths and challenges facing programs, encourage and recognize what is good, suggest possible solutions to existing or anticipated problems, and promote constructive change. Reviews assume that every program can be improved, and that regular program review directed toward identifying means

for improvement is a major responsibility of faculty, programs, and departments, not the central administration.

In assisting departments prepare their 2001-2002 Program Review reports, the following guidelines were developed:

- Be goal oriented.
- Look at the program as a whole.
- Be forward-thinking.
- Focus on assessment rather than observation.
- Express recommendations in terms of action.
- Approach program review as a continuous process.

III. Program Review Process

The Program Review process was divided into the following phases, which transpired over the course of a full academic year:

- Establishment of the annual timeline.
- Program definition.
- Clarification of criteria.
- Data analysis and distribution.
- Program Review workshops.
- Program Review report compilation.
- Campus feedback on reports.
- Roundtable Discussions.
- Associate Provost's and Provost's program assessments.
- Follow-up actions.

As the Program Review process unfolded, all documentation was available at the Academic Affairs web site at the following URL: <http://www.emich.edu/public/aa/pr/>.

Establishment of the annual timeline

The timeline was determined keeping several factors in mind (*Appendix B*). Data was extracted after the official close of the most recent academic year, typically occurring in late July to mid-August. A self-imposed deadline was established for data distribution by October 31, 2001. Workshops were scheduled during November – after data distribution. The reports were due to the Associate Provost by February 1, 2002 so that they could be distributed to Faculty Council and Graduate Council in time for their February meetings. Roundtable discussions were scheduled during April and May, while most faculty were still on campus. Provost assessments were distributed to departments by June 30, 2002 for use in future budgetary planning.

Program definition

The 2001-2002 Program Review process began with the identification and approval of program codes. Between September 12, 2001 and October 1, 2001, departments were contacted and requested to provide a list of programs to be reviewed. This list was then reviewed and either adjusted or approved by the Associate Provost, ensuring that all programs within the department participated in the process, according to the guidelines established by the Associate Provost's office. A total of 57 programs were reviewed from eight departments.

Clarification of criteria

On October 10, 2001 the Provost sent a letter to faculty that clarified and formalized the criteria to be used in making decisions about programs. The criteria include:

- The demonstrated quality of the program.
- The effectiveness of the program.
- The degree to which the program advances the University's mission.
- The efficiency of the program.
- The productivity of the program.

Data analysis and distribution

Data was collected, analyzed, and provided to the departments. The data sets were compiled by the Academic Programming office and delivered to the departments October 31, 2001. The data sets included data from summer 1996 through spring 2001 – five full academic years. Where possible, the data was sorted, totaled, and averaged by academic year and over the five-year period; graphs and charts were created to illustrate the results of the data analysis.

The data provided included:

- Accumulated GPA.
- Awards granted.
- Demographics, including:
 - Age.
 - Gender.
 - Ethnicity.
- Full time versus part time status.

Academic Programming also provided a list of data reports, from the Office of Institutional Analysis and Reporting, available within their departments. Additional data, such as grade distribution reports and section masters, was also made available through the Academic Programming office upon request.

Program Review workshops

Open workshops were scheduled in November to discuss the Program Review Manual, to provide details on what information should be included in the various report sections, and to answer questions. In addition, department visits were made to the Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance; Chemistry; Nursing; and Interdisciplinary Technology departments, to answer department-specific questions and clarify unresolved issues.

The workshops were hosted by the Associate Provost, with participation by the Director of Academic Programming and the Academic Programming Analyst. The Program Review report was outlined, per the manual, providing detail as to what types of information could be included. The workshops also answered questions regarding the report format, the review process, and the program data set. The sessions were well attended by deans, department heads, program coordinators, and faculty.

Program Review report compilation

Once the data was distributed and the workshops completed, the process was turned over to the academic departments to compile their reports. The Program Review reports were due back to the college deans by January 11. This meant that they had to be completed sooner, so department heads could draft the Department Overview, a new component of the Program Review report identified during the workshop phase of the process. The college deans then added their assessment and recommendations regarding the programs from their respective college. This element was slightly adjusted, in response to the college deans' request to provide a more formal structure to their role in the Program Review process. The full report, including the college deans' recommendations, was provided to the Associate Provost by February 1, 2002.

Campus feedback on reports

The completed Program Review reports were reproduced and distributed the first week of February to interested campus parties for feedback. The feedback parties included Faculty Council, Graduate Studies and Research, Continuing Education, and academic departments with significant interaction with those departments authoring the reports. The reviewing parties were given until March 21 to respond to the Associate Provost regarding the Program Review reports. Their responses were then summarized and used to form the agenda for the Roundtable Discussions.

Roundtable Discussions

Between April 1 and June 5, the departments undergoing Program Review for 2001-2002 participated in Roundtable Discussions. The discussions were open to the entire campus. Attendees included the Provost, the Associate Provost, college deans, department heads, program coordinators, faculty, representatives from Faculty Council, and other interested parties. The level of participation was exceptional and feedback was positive.

Throughout the Roundtable Discussions, several themes related to academic programming quality were highlighted by the Provost. Departments were asked to consider the markers of excellence in their programs, and to explore benchmarking their programs with those of other institutions for comparison. The Provost expressed that faculty contributions to program enrichment were extremely important to the quality of programs. There was also an expressed interest in assessment and outcomes, and the specific activities that ensure student success.

The Roundtable Discussions were intended to be an open forum where interested parties could discuss the Program Review reports, interpret the findings, and clarify the results. The meetings provided an opportunity for program coordinators, faculty, and department heads to interact directly with the Associate Provost and the Provost. A typical Roundtable Discussion included an overview from the department head, a brief background on each program, open, detailed

dialogue with the divisional leadership regarding the campus feedback, and closing comments from the Associate Provost and Provost.

Associate Provost's and Provost's program assessments

After the Roundtable Discussions, all of the documentation was reviewed and considered, and a program assessment recommendation was made to the Provost, by the Associate Provost for each program reviewed. After taking into account all of the documentation and the Associate Provost's recommendations, the Provost determined the final assessment for each program. The Provost and Associate Provost met to resolve the more complicated decisions, to clarify the justification for the various assessments, and to help develop the next steps.

Follow-up actions

The next steps for three of the four program assessment ratings was outlined in a summary matrix, provided to each department head. Deadlines were set, based on timeframes outlined in the Program Review Department Manual and discussions with the Associate Provost and Provost. Academic Programming will collect required documentation, monitor, and provide needed assistance for follow-up actions.

IV. Insights and Process Adjustments (Lessons Learned)

After a detailed analysis of the process and taking into consideration all of the feedback, some adjustments were made to the Program Review process. The changes were made in the following areas:

- Time
- Data
- Workshops
- Department Head Overview report
- College Dean's Recommendation report
- Roundtable Discussions
- The Program Review Department Manual

Time

The demands of Program Review are, and will continue to be, significant. The time allotted for certain phases of the process was clearly inadequate. In particular, data compilation and distribution occurred rather late, with delivery on October 31, 2001. Additionally, so that data questions could be addressed, the workshops were conducted in November. The result was that most departments did not start writing their reports until mid-November, and many spent their holiday break writing reports. The remainder of the process, including the Roundtable Discussions, was pushed back as a result. The timeline has been significantly adjusted for the coming year to include almost three additional months for the process. However, the data extraction is constrained by the official close of the academic year.

Data

Data extraction is dependent on the University's current enterprise software and the academic calendar. The limitations of the current enterprise software system, ISIS, impeded data

extraction. It also became apparent that a lot of information and data made available to departments was not used in program analysis. Many of the writers were unsure what data they needed, or how to use the data they had, to support their analysis.

The data extraction depended on services provided by Records and Registration to run data reports on identified program major codes. The generated reports were long and cumbersome to translate into usable form. Some of the requested or more useful data was simply unable to be extracted in usable form. Since the current ISIS reporting tool is rather complicated, Records and Registration will continue to extract data for Program Review until Banner, the University's new enterprise software system, is fully online and its reporting tools and data warehousing capabilities are functional. Data outside the ISIS database was not, and will not be, provided due to questions related to the accuracy of other data sources.

While there are several data reports available through regular campus distribution from the Office of Institutional Analysis and Reporting, faculty and program coordinators are unaware of them. Often, these reports are filed away and never used, or even thrown out. A list of these reports was provided to departments, and if they were unable to locate them, Academic Programming either sought them out or had them reproduced. In addition, Academic Programming has now been added to the distribution for most, if not all, reports, and is establishing a "hard copy" library.

The use of data in the Program Review report was mainly a question of location and appropriate usage. The data was, and will continue to be, a tool to support the analysis presented in the reports. The workshops provided guidance in this area, and the staff in Academic Programming made themselves available after the workshops to assist with questions. Additional data requests were processed on a case-by-case basis.

The data set was provided in both printed and electronic formats. It was converted to Excel format so that everyone could access not only the data, but the also the graphs and charts created from the data. Departments were then able to just "cut and paste" data directly into their reports if appropriate. This practice will continue until Banner comes online and its reporting tools and data warehousing capabilities become functional. Hopefully, the new Institutional Research office, the Banner implementation, and Academic Affairs' ongoing efforts to identify, isolate, and access data sources on campus, will minimize the data limitations for future Program Reviews.

Workshops

The Associate Provost hosted four workshops to provide guidance and answer questions regarding Program Review. The days of the week and hours were staggered to make them available to as many faculty and staff as possible. Additionally, departmental visits were made to the Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; Chemistry; Nursing; and Interdisciplinary Technology departments to offer more detailed assistance and answer department specific questions. The department visits were, for the most part, tailored and more productive. As a result, all workshops will be done by department for the coming year.

During the workshops, a slide show was presented that gave a detailed breakdown of the various components of the Program Review report, per the Program Review Departmental Manual. Included were detailed explanations and suggestions on what information would be applicable, and how and where to use the data to support the information being presented. Afterward, the slide show was made available on the web site, <http://www.emich.edu/public/aa/pr/>. The workshop discussions led to the addition of the Department Head Overview.

Department Head Overview report

During the Program Review workshops, the Department Head Overview emerged as a component of the Program Review reports that had been overlooked in the departmental manual. The Program Review Manual called for the reports to be submitted in departmental groups. However, it did not provide guidance on how that was to be done. The Department Head Overview would provide an efficient and effective way to summarize the departmental process, the department issues, and the programs, as well as a quick reference to someone who was interested in, but could not read, the entire report. A template for the Department Head Overview was developed and will be added to the updated Program Review Departmental Manual as an appendix.

College Dean's Recommendation report

Once the Program Review reports were turned in, the next step was for the college deans to review the final product and make their recommendations to the Associate Provost. Per their request, a template was developed to help guide them in writing their recommendations. The template will be included as an appendix in the updated Program Review Departmental Manual.

Roundtable Discussions

The addition of the Roundtable Discussions was a decision that was made early on in the process. The discussions were intended to focus and ensure human interaction as a Program Review submission follow-up. The discussions provided faculty, program coordinators, and department heads the opportunity to discuss their reports, as well as address any misunderstandings regarding the information presented. The discussions also provided a venue for faculty, program coordinators, and department heads to speak directly with the senior divisional leadership, including the Provost and Associate Provost, to explain their programs and express their concerns in an honest, straightforward manner.

Program Review Department Manual

Changes to the manual were made to capture the adjustments made to the process over the year, and to clarify some aspects of the process. These changes included relocating the ratings and results descriptions and the addition of the Department Head Overview and Dean's Recommendation report templates. Additional information regarding follow-up actions was added to provide structure to the follow-up actions required for ratings of (2) Continuation with changes, (3) Probation, and (4) Phase Out. The template for the actual report was also consolidated into a single document, to prevent confusion in the formatting for undergraduate versus graduate program reports.

V. Conclusions

Provost's program assessments

The culmination to the 2001-2002 Program Review process was the ratings decisions that were issued by the Provost. The decisions were based on the review and analysis of the reports, outside comments, open discussions, and recommendations provided by the Deans and the Associate Provost.

Assessment ratings

Every program received an assessment rating from the Provost. The table below lists the assessment ratings and explains the follow-up actions required for each, as well as the level of interaction necessary from various levels of leadership within the division, including the Provost, college deans, and department heads. There are also different time constraints listed for completing follow-up activities.

Assessment Ratings

(1) Continuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No specific requirements.• Continue normal continuous improvement activities already in place.
(2) Continuation with specific changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Write, have approved, and implement a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan.• Plan directed by the department head, who will report quarterly, in writing, to the college dean.• The college dean will report on progress to the Provost.
(3) Probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Write, have approved and implement a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan.• Must include a timeline, <u>not to exceed three years</u>, for implementation of its improvements.• The college dean must report quarterly, in writing to the Provost, on progress made.• Perform an abbreviated program review annually until all noted deficiencies are corrected.

Assessment Ratings (*continued*)

(4) Phase Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have 30 days to respond to the rating, in writing, to the Provost. • If the decision is upheld, department is required to develop a phase out plan, to be submitted to the Associate Provost within 30 days. • If phase out is implemented, faculty will be reassigned, retrained, or terminated based on stipulations in the Eastern Michigan University AAUP contract. • Once a plan is adopted, the college dean will report to the Associate Provost, in writing, on progress made on the Phase Out action.
---------------	--

2001-02 summary of program assessment ratings

The table below summarizes the results of the Provost’s assessment ratings. A *by program* listing of the ratings can be found in Appendix C. Following the table is a detailed explanation of the required follow-up actions for each of the rating categories and the purpose of the follow-up actions.

2001-02 Summary of Program Assessment Ratings

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Number of Programs</i>
(1) Continuation	23
(2) Continuation with specific changes	30
(3) Probation	2
(4) Phase Out	0

Detail in Appendix C.

Follow-up required

The twenty-three programs assigned a rating of (1) Continuation will be reviewed again in four years, based on the ten-year rotation schedule; no follow-up action is required.

Each of the thirty programs assigned a rating of (2) Continuation with Specific Changes will remain on the ten-year schedule, but the department head will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan, within three months of the receipt of the program rating. The purpose of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is to respond to the concerns highlighted in the Program Review final ratings, propose improvements, and develop a timeline for implementing the recommended improvements. The department head will send the completed plan to the college dean. Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is approved by the college dean, the department head will report to the dean quarterly, in writing, on progress made on the implementation of the plan. After receiving progress reports from the department head, the dean will summarize these reports for the Provost.

For programs rated (3) Probation, the department head will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan, within three months of the receipt of the program rating. Again, the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan will respond to the concerns highlighted in the Program Review final ratings, propose improvements, and develop a timeline for implementing the recommended improvements. The timeframe is not to exceed three years, to eliminate the deficiencies noted in the Program Review. Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is adopted, the dean will report to the Associate Provost quarterly, in writing, on progress made in the implementation of recommendations proposed in the report. After receiving progress reports from the dean, the Associate Provost will summarize these reports in discussion with the Provost. The program will also undergo an abbreviated version of Program Review annually, until noted deficiencies are rectified.

VI. 2002-2003 Program Review

Status

Program Review for 2002-2003 began in spring 2002 with establishment of the annual timeline (*Appendix D*). Scheduled departments were contacted in March, 2002 to begin defining programs to be reviewed. Program codes were approved by the Associate Provost in late June 2002. The workshops were scheduled during August and September 2002. An automated Excel program was developed over the summer, to organize the raw data files and create tables and graphs to provide a more analytical view of the data. Raw data requests were forwarded to Records and Registration in late July 2002, as well, corresponding with the official close of the 2001-02 academic year.

With raw data being requested much earlier this year, the plan is to distribute data sets by August 30, 2002 to correspond with faculty returning to campus for fall classes. This will give departments a chance to look over the data before they attend their workshops.

Workshops were scheduled much earlier this year and will be presented individually by department, to allow them to discuss and ask questions that are appropriate to their specific programs. Academic Programming will again be available to answer questions related to the Program Review Department Manual, program data set, and to address special data requests. This will provide more time for departments to compile their reports than last year.

Scheduling for Roundtable Discussions will be done in fall 2002. This will give departments, as well as administration, earlier notice for planning purposes. The meetings will be held again in the April/May time frame, to maximize faculty participation. Due to the size of a couple of this cycle's departments, separate Roundtable Discussions will be scheduled by program grouping.

Outlook for Program Review

The Office of the Associate Provost is dedicated to providing each department, undergoing Program Review, with complete, accurate, and timely data. As the University moves forward with the implementation of Banner and the development of the new Office of Institutional Research, data should become easier to access and more readily available across campus. Academic Programming will continue to identify and access additional data sources, as they become available.

As this year's programs move forward, the Provost is asking departments to consider the criteria of academic program quality that was clarified in his October 10, 2002 memo to faculty. He also emphasized markers of excellence, benchmarking, faculty contributions to program enrichment, assessment, and outcomes as themes to be addressed across programs, during the Roundtable Discussions.

Collaboration across departments will be highlighted as more and more interdisciplinary programs undergo Program Review in the coming years. It will be necessary for these programs to work together to develop complete and accurate reflections of the interdisciplinary nature of their programs, and to highlight the benefits to students, the departments, and to the University.

Assessment is emerging as a significant tool for both obtaining and maintaining program quality in higher education, not just at Eastern Michigan University. Benchmarking our programs against those of our peer institutions will help identify areas of improvement and highlight accomplishments. Identification of various methods of outreach, interdisciplinary activities, and other growth opportunities can only improve upon what already exists on our campus. Program Review assures that a cycle of continuous improvement will be established that keeps our programs current, marketable, innovative, and that maximizes educational opportunities, as prescribed in the University's Mission.

The Program Review process reinforces the campus culture of continuous improvement. It strengthens programming and research, and drives the strategic planning themes of academic programming. In conjunction with effective strategic leadership, an optimum learning experience is assured for our students.

**Appendix A
Academic Program Review Schedule
2001-2009**

Year	College	Department	# of UG ISIS codes	# of GR ISIS codes	Accreditation
2001-2002 2005-2006	CAS	Art	25	3	2002 Site Visit
		Geology and Geography	10	9	
		Chemistry	9	1	
		Psychology	2	5	
	COB	Computer Information Systems	1	1	
		COE	HPERD	8	6
	CHHS	Nursing	2	2	2002 Site Visit
	COT	Interdisciplinary Technology	6	3	
	2002-2003 2006-2007	CAS	Foreign Languages & Bilingual Studies	15	6
Political Science			5	1	
SAC-Undergrad			8		
Computer Science			2	1	
Mathematics			5	3	
COB		Business Admin	22	11	
		Accounting & Finance	5	2	
COE		Teacher Education	7	17	2003 Site Visit
CHHS		None			
COT		Industrial Technology	8	6	
			# of UG	# of GR	

Year	College	Department	ISIS codes	ISIS codes	Accreditation
2003-2004 2007-2008	CAS	Communication & Theatre Arts	11	9	
		English & Lit	14	5	
		SAC-Graduate Programs		3	
		Biology	5	6	
	COB	Marketing	6		
	COE	Leadership & Counseling		6	2004 Site Visit
	CHHS	HECR	6	7	
		AHP	6	1	2004 Site Visit
	COT	Business & Tech. Ed.	12	4	
2004-2005 2008-2009	CAS	African American Studies	1		
		Economics	3	4	
		History & Philosophy	8	3	
		Women's Studies	1	1	
		Music	5	5	
		Physics	6	3	
	COB	Management	4	1	2005 Site Visit
	COE				
		Special Education	8	7	
	CHHS	Social Work	1	5	
	COT	None			

Appendix B
2001-2002 Program Review Timeline

Determine list of programs	March 28, 2002
Dean's submit list of programs to Associate Provost	April 30, 2002
Distribution of data and workshops for departments	Oct. – Nov. 2001
Program analysis and compilation	Sept. 2001 – Jan. 2002
Program Review reports due to college deans	January 11, 2002
Centers & Institutes Program Review workshop	January 18, 2002
College deans submit reports to Associate Provost	February 1, 2002
Associate Provost submits reports to campus for feedback	February 7, 2002
Campus feedback formal responses due to Associate Provost	March 21, 2002
Campus feedback provided to college deans and department heads	March 22-29, 2002
Centers & Institutes reports due to Associate Vice President of Graduate Studies and Research	March 15, 2002
Roundtable Discussions	April 15 – May 31, 2002
Provost and Associate Provost assessments	June 3 – 21, 2002
Annual Report on Centers & Institutes Program Review	June 30, 2002
Annual Report on Academic Program Review	September 30, 2002

APPENDIX C
Provost Ratings Decisions by Department and Program Code

<u><i>Department</i></u>	<u><i>Program</i></u>	<u><i>Recommendation</i></u>	<u><i>Explanation</i></u>
GEOG/GEOL	GE01	2	Continuation with changes
	GE31	2	Continuation with changes
	GE02	1	Continuation
	GE32	2	Continuation with changes
	GE03	1	Continuation
	GE04	1	Continuation
	GE98	1	Continuation
	GE97	1	Continuation
	GE96	1	Continuation
CHEM	CH01	1	Continuation
	CH02	1	Continuation
	CH31	2	Continuation with changes
	CH03	1	Continuation
	CH04	1	Continuation
	CH05	2	Continuation with changes
	CH07	2	Continuation with changes
	CH08	2	Continuation with changes
	CH09	2	Continuation with changes
	CH99	1	Continuation
ART	AR01	1	Continuation
	AR02	2	Continuation with changes
	AR03	1	Continuation
	AR31	2	Continuation with changes
	AR32	1	Continuation
	AR97	1	Continuation
	AR98	1	Continuation
	AR99	1	Continuation
	INDT	ID01	2
ID05		2	Continuation with changes
ID06		2	Continuation with changes
ID07		2	Continuation with changes
ID08		3	Probation
ID09		2	Continuation with changes
ID98		2	Continuation with changes
ID99		2	Continuation with changes
S & C		2	Continuation with changes
HPERD	PE01	1	Continuation
	PE31	1	Continuation
	PE02	2	Continuation with changes
	PE04	3	Probation
	PE06	2	Continuation with changes
	PE08	1	Continuation
	PE98	2	Continuation with changes

<u>Department</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
PSYCH	PS01	1	Continuation
	PS31	2	Continuation with changes
	PS99	2	Continuation with changes
	PS9998	1	Continuation
	PS9999	1	Continuation
CIS	OR06	2	Continuation with changes
	OR99	2	Continuation with changes
NURSING	NU01	2	Continuation with changes
	NU03	2	Continuation with changes
	NU97	2	Continuation with changes
	NU98	2	Continuation with changes
	NU99	2	Continuation with changes

Appendix D
2002-2003 Program Review Timeline

Determine list of programs	March 28, 2002
College deans submit list of programs to Associate Provost	April 30, 2002
Associate Provost distributes final list of programs to departments	June 30, 2002
Workshops and distribution of data	October, 2002
Program analysis and report compilation	Sept 2002 – Jan 2003
Reports due to college deans	January 10, 2003
College deans submit reports to Associate Provost	January 31, 2003
Associate Provost submits reports to campus peer groups for feedback	February 14, 2003
Peer groups formal responses due to Associate Provost	March 21, 2003
Peer group responses provided to college deans and department heads	March 24-26, 2003
Roundtable Discussions	April 1 – June 13, 2003
Provost and Associate Provost assessments	June 16 – 20, 2003
Annual Report on Academic Programming	September 30, 2003