

**2002-03**  
**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW**  
**ANNUAL REPORT**

**OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST**  
**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**  
**SEPTEMBER 2003**

# 2002-03 PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTIONS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	3
II. 2001-2002PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS .....	4
III. 2002-2003PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS .....	5
IV. 2002-2003 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS .....	9
V. 2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS.....	9
VI. FOLLOW-UP IN PROGRESS .....	11
VII. OUTLOOK .....	12
 <u>APPENDICES</u>	
A .....	14
B .....	16
C .....	17
D .....	33

## **2002-2003 Program Review Annual Report**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

In preparation for the 2001 NCA visit, reinstatement of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University became a priority. The Associate Provost restructured the process and developed a draft Program Review Departmental Manual. After working closely with the Associate Provost, Faculty Council unanimously approved the manual in spring 2001. A ten-year rotation was established (*Appendix A*) 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 the findings of the 2001-2002 Program Review process; outline the 2002-2003 process; present the results of 2002-2003, including challenges faced; shape 2003-2004 Program Review; describe the follow-up activities and timelines; and explain plans for 2003-2004 and beyond. The report will highlight the successes, discuss the adjustments made along the way to streamline and enhance the process, describe the follow-up actions and their current status, and outline strategies to enhance the Program Review process in the future.

#### **Overview of the Program Review process**

The Program Review process is divided into the following phases, which in the past, have transpired over the course of one academic year:

- Establishment of the annual timeline (*Appendix B*).
- Program definition.
- Data analysis and distribution.
- Department workshops.
- Report compilation.
- Campus feedback on reports.
- Roundtable Discussions.
- Associate Provost's and Provost's program assessments.
- Follow-up actions.

As the Program Review process unfolds each year, all documents are made available on the Academic Affairs web site at the following URL: <http://www.emich.edu/public/aa/pr/>.

#### **Assessment ratings**

Each year, after receiving a recommendation from the Associate Provost, every program receives an assessment rating from the Provost that includes follow up actions and deadlines. Assessment ratings are the result of collaborative discussions between the Associate Provost and the Provost, and take into consideration all of the materials and information available regarding each program. The table below lists the assessment rating categories and summarizes required follow up actions, 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.

<b>ASSESSMENT RATINGS</b>	
(1) Continuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific requirements.</li> <li>• Continue normal continuous improvement activities already in place.</li> </ul>
(2) Continuation with specific changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write, have approved, and implement a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan.</li> <li>• Plan directed by the department head, who will report quarterly, in writing, to the college dean.</li> <li>• The college dean will report on progress to the Provost.</li> </ul>
(3) Probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write, have approved and implement a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan.</li> <li>• Must include a timeline, <u>not to exceed three years</u>, for implementation of its improvements.</li> <li>• The college dean must report quarterly, in writing to the Provost, on progress made.</li> <li>• Perform an abbreviated program review annually until all noted deficiencies are corrected.</li> </ul>
(4) Phase Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have 30 days to respond to the rating, in writing, to the Provost.</li> <li>• If the decision is upheld, department is required to develop a phase out plan, to be submitted to the Associate Provost within 30 days.</li> <li>• If phase out is implemented, faculty will be reassigned, retrained, or terminated based on stipulations in the Eastern Michigan University AAUP contract.</li> <li>• Once a plan is adopted, the college dean will report to the Associate Provost, in writing, on progress made on the Phase Out action.</li> </ul>

## **II. 2001-2002 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS**

### **Provost's program assessments**

The culmination to the 2001-2002 Program Review process were the recommendations from the Associate Provost and the assessment rating decisions (summarized in the table above) 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 College Deans. The table below summarizes the results of the Provost's assessment ratings.

<b>2001-2002 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATINGS</b>	
<i>RATING</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
<b>(1) Continuation</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>(2) Continuation with specific changes</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>(3) Probation</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(4) Phase Out</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>55</b>

*Detail in Appendix C*

A *by program* listing of the ratings, including specific follow up actions and due dates, can be found in Appendix C. Section VI of the report will discuss the status of follow up actions in detail.

### **III. 2002-2003 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS**

#### **Process overview**

Program Review 2002-2003 initiated in spring 2002 with establishment of an annual timeline (*Appendix B*). The Office of Academic Programming determined a tentative list of ISIS program codes in each department. Scheduled departments were contacted in March, 2002 by the Office of Academic Programming to review and define which programs would be reviewed. The final list was approved by the Associate Provost in late June 2002.

Due to the complicated nature of ISIS data extraction, determination of what data would be provided was based on discussions between Academic Programming staff and that of the Office of Records and Registration, regarding ISIS data accessibility. Data requests were forwarded to the Office of Records and Registration in late July 2002, corresponding with the official close of the 2001-02 academic year. The Office of Records and Registration was heavily involved in the Banner conversion at the time and deadlines that had previously been set were not met.

An automated Excel program was developed over the summer by Academic Programming staff, to organize the data files and create tables and graphs to provide a more analytical view of the data. Data was delivered to the Office of Academic Programming in early September, was analyzed and organized, and delivered to departments between late September and early October. There was extensive follow-up throughout the fall term on data, due to errors and inaccuracies.

Academic Programming conducted individual department workshops during August and September 2002. The department workshop for Teacher Education highlighted significant program review conflicts with NCATE accreditation and state reporting deadlines for the department. As a result, the Teacher Education program review was rescheduled to the 2004-2005 rotation.

Roundtable Discussions were scheduled in fall 2002 to give departments, as well as administration, early notice for their April – June meeting dates. Program Review reports were

due to College Deans in early January and to the Associate Provost by January 31, 2003. They were distributed for comment, forming the agenda for the Roundtable Discussions, the final phase of the program review process. Once complete, all information was reviewed and ratings determined in a collaborative effort between the Associate Provost and the Provost.

### **Program definition**

The Office of Academic Programming, using resources from Course and Catalog Maintenance and Course and Program Development, determined a tentative list of ISIS program codes in each department. Scheduled departments were contacted in March, 2002 by the Office of Academic Programming, through a memorandum from the Associate Provost, to review and define which programs would be reviewed. Staff from the Office of Academic Programming then met with each department head, in preparation for department workshops. Program codes were confirmed along with departments' intentions with regard to combining similar programs (e.g. Mathematics versus Mathematics – Secondary or Elementary Teaching) into single reports to prevent redundancy. Changes were made to Academic Programming records to reflect the final understanding of program codes and how they would be reviewed.

### **Department workshops and preparation**

Following early meetings with department heads to discuss program codes and general Program Review questions, individual department workshops were prepared and conducted by Academic Programming staff, including Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming, Lynn Tilton, Director, Course and Catalog Maintenance, and Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst. They were held in August and September 2002. Academic Programming staff visited each department separately, in order to present department specific materials and answer questions. This was earlier than the previous year's workshops, which were held in late October and early November. Workshops covered the broad nature of Program Review, explaining the history and general philosophy behind the process. The report features were explained and suggestions were offered as to what type of data and information would be appropriate. Data was discussed and explained and departments had an opportunity to ask questions about the data. The Department Head Overview was also explained so that department heads were aware of their role in the process. The timeline was presented twice during the presentation to be sure that everyone was aware of their current status and get a sense of when their deadlines were. The individual department workshops were tailored and much more productive than the previous year's workshops, which were held in large groups in the Halle Library.

### **Data analysis and distribution**

Data files were requested from the Office of Records and Registration in late July (earlier than the previous year) for two reasons; one, to give the Office of Academic Programming more time for data clean up and organization. The other reason was because of the conversion from ISIS to the Banner system, the Office of Records and Registration was due to begin intensive implementation activities and would not have the time to run data extract reports at a later date.

Academic Programming worked over the summer to develop an automated program that would perform simple analysis and calculations of the data files. The initial goal was to distribute data by the Labor Day weekend so departments would have their data readily accessible when faculty returned for the fall term. This internal deadline was not met due to the complicated nature of

data extraction and reporting from the ISIS database. The Office of Records and Registration, who have staff trained in this area, was heavily involved in the ISIS to Banner conversion and was not able to meet our request, resulting in ISIS data extract files not being delivered to the Office of Academic Programming until early September.

Once data was received, the Academic Programs Analyst ran the automated analysis program on the data, preparing a separate dataset for each program. The datasets included lists, tables, graphs, trend lines, and comparative pivot charts, along with definitions to explain the data for the time period summer 1996 to spring 2002, six full years.

The datasets that were distributed included:

- Accumulated GPA.
- Awards (degrees) granted.
- Hours to graduate.
- Demographics, including:
  - Age.
  - Ethnicity.
  - Gender.
  - Residency.
- Full time versus part time status.

Datasets were produced in both print and electronic (Excel) formats, and delivered to departments between late September and early October. Preliminary review by departments indicated significant errors. In evaluating the distributed data, the problems were confirmed. The Academic Programs Analyst made initial adjustments to the automated program and updated data sets were distributed. However, upon further scrutiny, it was discovered that only some of the original inaccuracies were rectified. In the end, most of the data had to be re-organized and prepared manually by the Academic Programs Analyst.

The data challenges added to the limited confidence of the data in general, and were a significant infringement on time for departmental access to data. In response, the Academic Programs Analyst met with each department head individually, to deliver a final data set and verify the changes and corrections with them, before it was distributed to faculty to use in their report compilation. The situation accentuated the need for accurate, timely, accessible, and user-friendly data, for divisional leadership to use not only for Program Review, but for operational planning and decision making. The circumstances formed the basis for developing a cooperative and collaborative relationship with the new Office of Institutional Research.

### **Time**

The demands of Program Review on faculty and administration continue to be significant. Adjustments were made for this rotation, including workshops being held in August and September, and data delivery beginning in September.

### **Analysis & report compilation**

Once department workshops were completed, the program analysis process was handed off to the departments to begin work. The Office of Academic Programming followed up with data and assistance, with the Academic Programs Analyst working one on one with department heads and faculty to answer both data and general review related questions. Bill Miller, Director, Program and Course Development and Lynn Tilton, Director, Course and Catalog Maintenance, also fielded questions from departments, and provided information and direction when necessary. The services of the Office of Academic Programming staff were offered for assistance throughout the report compilation period.

Departments were encouraged to set internal due dates, as well as to appoint a department coordinator for the effort. Reports were due to the College Deans by 10 January 2003 and to the Associate Provost by 31 January 2003.

### **Campus feedback**

In early February 2003, the Academic Programs Analyst, with help from a graduate assistant, duplicated and distributed Program Review reports to interested parties across campus for comment. Copies of reports were sent to Faculty Council, Graduate Council, the Graduate School, Continuing Education, and departments with significant interface. Comments were due to the Associate Provost by 21 March 2003 so they could be summarized and delivered to departments, along with an agenda for Roundtable Discussions based on the comments.

### **Roundtable Discussions**

The Roundtable Discussions were 2-hour long, open meetings, to discuss each department's Program Review reports. They were scheduled by the Academic Programs Analyst during fall 2002 and took place between 10 April 2003 and 25 June 2003. The attendees included the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, College Deans, department heads, faculty, program coordinators, and other interested parties. Faculty Council sent a representative to every meeting.

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 respond to campus feedback and to interact directly with the Associate Provost and the Provost. A typical Roundtable Discussion included an overview from the department head and open, detailed dialogue with the divisional leadership regarding and guided by the campus feedback, and closing comments from the department head, College Dean, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, Associate Provost and Provost.

Certain themes emerged as Roundtable Discussions took place. Several programs raised issues concerning marketing and recruiting, career advising, alumni relations, academic advising, data support and Institutional Research, diversity, and AQIP. There was discussion surrounding the notion of shared responsibility between the department and Dean's office, and the department and such entities as University Marketing, Career Services, and Alumni Affairs, Academic Advising, and the Office of Institutional Research. There was also discussion regarding the current budget situation and how, as a group, there is a need to change the way things are done

and to improve efficiency and effectiveness, while maximizing limited resources. Roundtable Discussions have fostered a divisional culture of openness and honesty, and have opened the door to several collaborative inter-disciplinary discussions and relationships across campus.

**Associate Provost’s and Provost’s program assessments**

After the Roundtable Discussions, all of the program analysis 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. Decisions were distributed to College Deans, with department heads provided a courtesy copy.

**IV. 2002-2003 PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS**

**Provost’s program assessments**

The culmination of the 2002-2003 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 College Deans and the Associate Provost. The rating levels are described in Section I of this report.

**2002-2003 summary of program assessment ratings**

The table below summarizes the results of the Provost’s assessment ratings for the 2002-2003 rotation of Program Review. A *by program* listing of the ratings, including specific follow up actions and due dates, can be found in Appendix D. Section VI of the report will discuss the status of follow up actions in detail.

<b>2002-03 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RATINGS</b>	
<i>RATINGS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
<b>(1) Continuation</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>(2) Continuation with specific changes</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>(3) Probation</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(4) Phase Out</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>71</b>

*Detail in Appendix D.*

**V. 2003-2004 PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS**

While several adjustments were made to the Program Review process after the first rotation, 2003-2004 Program Review warranted improvements were made in the areas of time, funding and data to continue to refine the process. Additionally, the Academic Programming staff updated the Program Review Department Manual, improved the workshop presentation, creating

an individual workshop presentation for each department, and prepared updated materials for Roundtable Discussions.

**Time**

Time has been a continuous issue in the Program Review process. Moving up the timeline during the 2002-2003 rotation by a couple of months did not resolve the problem. The time allowed was still inadequate and departments again struggled to make their January deadlines. As a result, workshops for the 2003-2004 rotation were conducted winter 2003 and data distribution was done in spring 2003. This adjustment added approximately six months to the process. The report compilation process began with the workshops and departments have been working on their reports ever since.

**Funding**

Funding was not provided to departments during the 2001-2002 rotation or the 2002-2003 rotation. However, it was apparent with the adjustment in time, that departments would need resources to begin the process earlier in the year.

The Provost set aside funding for departments for Program Review work performed during spring and summer 2003 terms. Funding was made available to the departments undergoing Program Review for the 2003-2004 rotation. It was not retroactive to the two prior years. The funds were distributed 1 May 2003 in the following manner:

- Each department received a base amount of \$1000.
- Each department then received an additional \$200 per program review report.
- Specific amounts by department are:

<b>Funding for Departments Undergoing 2003-04 Program Review</b>				
<b>Department</b>	<b># UG Program Codes</b>	<b># GR Program Codes</b>	<b>Total # Program Codes</b>	<b>Total \$ (including the base \$1000/dept.)</b>
Communications & Theatre Arts	7	4	11	\$3,200
English Language & Literature	11	5	16	\$4,200
Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminology (graduate only)	0	3	3	\$1,600
Biology	6	6	12	\$3,400
Marketing	6	0	6	\$2,200
Leadership & Counseling	0	6	6	\$2,200
Human, Environmental, and Consumer Resources	4	4	8	\$2,600

Department	# UG Program Codes	# GR Program Codes	Total # Program Codes	Total \$ (including the base \$1000/dept.)
Associated Health Professions	6	3	9	\$2,800
Business & Technology Education	9	3	12	\$3,400
<i>Total Disbursement</i>			83	<i>\$25,600</i>

### Data

The data set was refined and organized manually, to avoid the errors that occurred during the 2002-2003 rotation. The data sets were provided in both printed and electronic (Excel) formats and delivered directly to department heads between 15 May 2003 and 30 June 2003.

Due to the implementation of the Banner system in the midst of the academic year the departments in the 2003-2004 rotation of Program Review would receive data from the same timeframe as the 2002-2003 rotation. This includes summer 1996 through spring 2002, giving them six full years of data to work from.

## VI. FOLLOW UP IN PROGRESS ON PROGRAM REVIEW 2001-2002 & 2002-2003

Per the Program Review Department Manual, pages 13-14, each Program Review report is assigned a rating by the Provost. Each rating includes specific follow-up activities and timelines, which are explained below. To date, there are a few follow up activities in progress from the 2001-2002 Program Review rotation (*Appendix C*) and follow up activities for the 2002-2003 Program Review rotation (*Appendix D*) are currently in the early stages. Additionally, the Program Review Department Manual is updated each year, to make appropriate adjustments and clarifications, in conjunction with the writing of the Annual Report.

### Follow up guidelines

Follow up guidelines are summarized in the table in Section I, page 4 of this report. Specific details can be found on pages 13-14 of the Program Review Department Manual.

### 2001-2002 Follow up activities

Per the table on page 5 of this report and the tables in Appendix C, 23 programs were rated (1) Continuation, and have no formal follow up actions required.

There were 30 programs rated (2) Continuation with specific changes. Deans are monitoring progress on approved Post-Review Improvement plans for these programs.

There were 2 programs rated (3) Probation. The Office of Academic Programming is responsible for monitoring these follow up activities. Currently, for ID08 – Independent Study Program for Public Safety program, the department has responded with plans to end date and phase out the program by 2005. Plans are being developed to halt admissions, shelve, and ultimately phase out PE04 – Recreation and Parks Management. Additionally, phase out plans

for the two Centers and Institutes that were recommended for phase out have begun implementation and requests have been submitted to remove web page links to them.

### **2002-2003 Follow up activities**

Per the table on page 8 of this report, 34 programs were rated (1) Continuation, and have no formal follow up actions required.

There were 22 programs rated (2) Continuation with specific changes. Departments are in the early stages of developing Post-Review Improvement Plans, which must be approved by the department head and College Dean before implementation can begin. College Deans will then monitor progress on approved Post-Review Improvement plans.

There were 10 programs rated (3) Probation, primarily due to inter-college curricular conflicts. Departments are in the early stages of developing Post-Review Improvement Plans, which must be approved by the department head and College Dean before implementation can begin. Post-Review Improvement Plans must include a timeline that does not exceed 3 years. The program must go through Program Review annually until the rating of (3) Probation is removed. The Office of Academic Programming is responsible for monitoring follow up activities.

There were 5 programs rated (4) Phase Out, formalizing previous departmental decisions. The Office of Academic Programming will assist in the implementation of the Phase Out plan developed for the program.

General follow up activities are outlined on pages 13-14 of the Program Review Department Manual, with program specific ones described on the tables enclosed in Appendix D. Programs rated (3) Probation, will have the services of the Office of Academic Programming, including Course and Program Development, Course and Catalog Maintenance, and Undergraduate Studies available for assistance with the development and implementation of Post-Review Improvement Plans. The Office of Academic Programming, Academic Programs Analyst bears responsibility for monitoring the progress of follow up actions. Programs rated (4) Phase Out will develop a Phase Out plan that will be implemented with the assistance of Course and Catalog Maintenance.

Programs have the opportunity to appeal any decision made directly to the Provost.

### **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 include some minor adjustments to graduate faculty and lecturer qualifications, and adding the topic of diversity to the report requirements.

## **OUTLOOK**

### **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. The goal for the 2003-2004 rotation was to access and provide data for the 2002-2003 academic year by the end of August 2003. Reporting, by program, from the Banner system has not yet been successful. The Office of Academic Programming has acquired site licenses for the new reporting tool, Crystal Reports, and now has access to the Banner web client. While staff have not yet been trained on the interface between the two products, plans are underway for this to be a priority during fall 2003.

Additionally, the staff in the Office of Academic Programming has begun to establish a cooperative and collaborative relationship with the staff of the new Office of Institutional Research. The goal is to ultimately turn over the responsibility of data extraction and reporting for Program Review to the Office of Institutional Research. The Office of Academic Programming will continue to work on developing the relationship and providing guidance regarding departmental data needs, to support their Program Review efforts.

Diversity is an important initiative that needs to be emphasized in academic experiences across campus. In response, the Office of Academic Programming will be working with the Office of Diversity/Affirmative Action to more fully explore the infusion of diversity into the curriculum and academic programs in general.

As program review commences each year, the collaborative efforts of the staff in Academic Programming are instrumental to the success of the process. It is through the hard work of Brian Hoxie, Director, Academic Programming, Lynn Tilton, Director, Course and Catalog Maintenance, Bill Miller, Director, Course and Program Development, and Donelle Goerlitz, Academic Programs Analyst, that Program Review is successful. Each rotation of Program Review entails extensive updating and enhancement, in order to continually improve the process. As Program Review becomes institutionalized, it will be more complex, due to the many overlapping follow up activities. It is critical that this follow up is monitored and enforced to ensure full and complete compliance, which will result in the improvement of our academic programs and the vitality of the curriculum.

The Program Review process has demonstrated its value as a tool for assessing program quality, effectiveness, efficiency, and benefit. The process assures that our academic programs are meeting student and regional needs and provides a means for students to maximize their potential for success. It institutes and reinforces a campus culture of continuous improvement, and efficient and effective use of resources, while providing faculty and administration a formal means to evaluate programs and integrate continuous improvement strategies.

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

<b>Year</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b># of UG ISIS codes</b>	<b># of GR ISIS codes</b>	<b>Accreditation</b>	
<b>2001-2002 2005-2006</b>	<b>CAS</b>	<b>Art</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2002 Site Visit</b>	
		<b>Geology and Geography</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>		
		<b>Chemistry</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>		
		<b>Psychology</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>		
	<b>COB</b>	<b>Computer Information Systems</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		
		<b>COE</b>	<b>HPERD</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	
	<b>CHHS</b>	<b>Nursing</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2002 Site Visit</b>	
	<b>COT</b>	<b>Interdisciplinary Technology</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>2002-2003 2006-2007</b>	<b>CAS</b>	<b>Foreign Lang &amp; Bilingual Studies</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2003 Site Visit</b>	
		<b>Political Science</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>		
		<b>SAC-Undergrad</b>	<b>8</b>			
		<b>Computer Science</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		
		<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>		
	<b>COB</b>	<b>Business Admin Accounting &amp; Finance</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>11</b>		
		<b>COE</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	
	<b>CHHS</b>	<i>Teacher Ed moved to 05-06</i>				
	<b>COT</b>	<b>None</b>				
		<b>Industrial Technology</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>		

<b>Year</b>	<b>College</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b># of UG ISIS codes</b>	<b># of GR ISIS codes</b>	<b>Accreditation</b>
<b>2003-2004 2007-2008</b>	<b>CAS</b>	<b>Communication &amp; Theatre Arts</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	
		<b>English &amp; Lit</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	
		<b>SAC-Graduate Programs</b>		<b>3</b>	
		<b>Biology</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	
	<b>COB</b>	<b>Marketing</b>	<b>6</b>		
	<b>COE</b>	<b>Leadership &amp; Counseling</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>2004 Site Visit</b>
	<b>CHHS</b>	<b>HECR</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	
		<b>AHP</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2004 Site Visit</b>
	<b>COT</b>	<b>Business &amp; Tech. Ed.</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>2004-2005 2008-2009</b>	<b>CAS</b>	<b>African American Studies</b>	<b>1</b>		
		<b>Economics</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
		<b>History &amp; Philosophy</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	
		<b>Women's Studies</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	
		<b>Music</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
		<b>Physics</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	
	<b>COB</b>	<b>Management</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2005 Site Visit</b>
	<b>COE</b>	<b>Teacher Education</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2003 Site Visit</b>
		<b>Special Education</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	
	<b>CHHS</b>	<b>Social Work</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	
	<b>COT</b>	<b>None</b>			

**Appendix B**  
**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