

**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

# **PROGRAM REVIEW DEPARTMENT MANUAL**



# **PROGRAM REVIEW AT EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

**2001-2011**

**Last updated 11/11/02**

## Table of Contents

	Page
Definition and Purpose of Program Review . . . . .	3
Philosophy of Program Review . . . . .	4
Types of Program Reviews . . . . .	4
Recent History of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University. . . . .	4
Goals of Program Review . . . . .	6
Successful Program Review . . . . .	6
Assumptions Undergirding the Academic Program Review System . . . . .	7
Determination of Programs in a Department . . . . .	7
The Program Review Schedule Cycle . . . . .	9
Guidelines for Program Review Reports . . . . .	11
Components of the Program Review Process. . . . .	12
Explanation of Ratings . . . . .	13
Annual Associate Vice President's Report on Academic Programming . . . . .	15
Resource Allocation as a Result of Program Review . . . . .	15
Conclusion . . . . .	15
References . . . . .	16
Appendix A: The Structure of the Program Review Report . . . . .	17
Appendix B: Departmental Overview . . . . .	26
Appendix C: Dean's Summary, Ratings, and Recommendations . . . . .	28
Appendix D: The Structure of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan . . . . .	30

## **Program Review at Eastern Michigan University 2000-2010**

### Definition and Purpose of Program Review

Academic program review has become an important function on most university campuses during the past two decades (Kells, 1995). It is a widely accepted tool for assessing such factors as program quality, effectiveness, demand, benefit, and efficiency (Conrad and Wilson, 1985). The program review process should be closely connected to Eastern Michigan University's mission and to our comprehensive strategic planning process that encourages Eastern Michigan University to examine its strengths and weaknesses and develop a plan on the basis of those findings. That plan will include steps to implement and evaluate recommended program changes in a continuous loop of goal – action – results – goal activities (Michael 1998).

Eastern Michigan University's mission statement asserts, "we maximize educational opportunities and personal and professional growth for students from diverse backgrounds through an array of baccalaureate, master's and doctoral programs." To that end, the purpose of Program Review is to provide the faculty and academic affairs with the structure, a plan of action, and information they need to accomplish the following six primary tasks:

- A. To provide structure, a plan of action, and information that enhances continuous quality improvement.
- B. To strengthen academic programs deemed to be of high quality and that are closely aligned with Eastern Michigan University's mission.
- C. To identify and support programs capable of maintaining or increasing student enrollments.
- D. To tie the budget process to Program Review results to maximize the use of limited resources.
- E. To identify and assist programs that are considered to be marginal, but have the capacity for significant improvement, through implementation of a plan of action approved by Divisional administrators.
- F. To discontinue/eliminate programs that are no longer making essential contributions to the institutional mission or that have become obsolete.

## Philosophy 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 of programs, encourage and recognize what is good, suggest possible solutions to existing or anticipated problems, and promote constructive change.

## Types of Program Reviews

Barak and Brier (1990) classified program reviews into four basic types according to their primary motivation:

- (1) Formative Review – The primary responsibility for the review rests with the faculty connected with the program.
- (2) Summative Review – The review is usually conducted by persons external to the program to be reviewed. Generally, such reviews are conducted by departments, schools or districts, institutions, systems, and the state.
- (3) Public Relations Review – While not necessarily a whitewash, this type of program review tends to be self-serving and is not generally viewed as legitimate by professional evaluators. Responsibility for this type of review usually rests with those closest to the program.
- (4) Authoritative Review – The review is conducted primarily as an expression of the power of the agency or its leader. This may or may not produce a legitimate evaluation.

While formative review is the most important aspect of any program review, the use of summative reviews (i.e., external accreditations) is seen as an appropriate and valuable adjunct to self-review (Satterlee, 1992).

## Recent History of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University

Program Review was initiated 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 that people have when something new is initiated, led to the production of Program Review documents that were 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 and the success of departments in accomplishing 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, follow-up actions on the part of academic departments 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, 197 academic programs were reviewed. Sixty-nine programs (35%) were required to implement program changes. Each of the five colleges was represented on the list of 69 programs. The focus of the required changes was on program improvement and related student learning, and not on the performance of individual faculty. The following numbers represent a breakdown of the categories where remedial action was required.

Continuation without Change	128
Continuation with Specific Changes Required	54
Probation	4
<u>Phase out</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	197

With the exception of the 11 programs that were phased out, most of the remainder have made the requested changes and the quality of these programs and enrollments in them have shown improvement. In a few cases, programs have remained on "Continuation with Specific Changes Required" or "Probation" status because the progress they made has not yet moved them to the "Continuation" category.

In 1998, with changes in personnel in the Office of the Associate Provost, and the increased emphasis of Eastern Michigan University on utilizing its formal assessment program and its specialized accreditation of academic programs, the Provost invoked a brief suspension of the Program Review system.

During the spring and summer of 2000, the Program Review system was revised by the Associate Provost. The revision implemented ideas taken from exemplary program review systems developed at other universities (e.g., University of Northern Florida, 2000) and from more recent program review literature (Wergin, 1999). The Program Review Departmental Manual was rewritten and now includes guidelines for the identification of programs within a department, a description of the Program Review and the post-review program process, and outlines for writing the Program Review report and the post-review program report. A new schedule mandates separate reviews of all programs, both graduate and undergraduate, within a department in the same year, unless a department with multiple programs requests and receives permission from the Associate Provost to conduct reviews of separate programs in successive years. In the case of interdisciplinary programs, the department receiving student credit hour (SCH) credit is responsible for preparing the Program Review, with the participation of the other departments involved in the program. The responsibility for implementing and managing the program review process is designated to the Associate Provost.

#### Goals of Program Review

The institutional goals of Program Review are to:

- A. Evaluate the viability, value, quality, effectiveness, and efficient use of resources of each of the academic programs at Eastern Michigan University.
- B. Integrate to the fullest extent possible program review and assessment activities with student outcomes and accreditation self-studies.
- C. Contribute significantly to the University's effort to build a culture of academic quality, through use of program review.
- D. Provide direction and priorities for the University that can be used for needs assessment, resource allocation, and future planning.
- E. Provide structure, a plan of action, and information for continuous program improvement.

### Successful Program Review

A successful Program Review system standardizes the time frame for evaluation of institutional effectiveness, encourages continuous improvement, and facilitates accreditation or reaccreditation as well as the generation of meaningful annual planning and accountability reports. It should also document the ways in which each program contributes toward the fulfillment of the University's mission of providing a learning environment that promotes academic and personal excellence.

According to Barak and Sweeney (1995) successful program review includes:

- A. Interest and leadership by department heads, deans, and vice presidents.
- B. A decision-making process that fits the institutional environment.
- C. Simple and readily understandable structures and policies
- D. Attention to each element of the decision-making process
- E. Realism about exactly what program review can contribute to institutional improvement, and the manner in which it functions.

#### Assumptions Undergirding the Academic Program Review System

The following assumptions guide the implementation of the academic Program Review system at Eastern Michigan University:

- A. The academic Program Review process requires accurate, consistent, and current data that will be provided to department heads by the Provost's office in cooperation with the Office of Institutional Research at the beginning of each academic program review cycle.
- B. The appropriate program faculty and department head will prepare the program review report and, if necessary, the post-review program improvement plan. Eastern Michigan University's belief that, for the program review effort to be effective, faculty must have both ownership of, and responsibility for, assessment activities has been stated in all printed materials, including the brochure, "Questions and Answers about Assessment in the Academic Major at EMU," which was issued to all faculty and staff in September, 1993.
- C. The program will be the unit of analysis for the internal academic Program Review. Separate reports on each program within a department are expected, as are separate program reviews for undergraduate and graduate programs, unless otherwise approved by the Associate Provost.
- D. The academic Program Review process is tied directly to the resource allocation process within the Division of Academic Affairs and the Colleges. Academic Program Review results will be released at the end of the academic year so that budgetary actions can be undertaken as soon as possible.

#### Determination of Programs in a Department

The University mandates Program review, not department review. Most academic programs are housed within single academic departments; some interdisciplinary programs, for example, are not. The Division of Academic Affairs will maintain a calendar scheduling departments and interdisciplinary programs for academic program review.

This schedule does not indicate programs offered within each department. The Division of Academic Affairs will ask each department head prior to the beginning of the academic program review year to prepare a list of the various programs offered within the department. The list will be advanced to the Associate Provost for review and endorsement.

Although it is possible that a department may determine that it offers only one program, this conclusion should not be based on the convenience of conducting a single program review. Because the criteria for defining a program are not precise, the department head has a certain degree of flexibility in the identification of a program within the department. The Eastern Michigan University Academic Department Profile 1998-1999 (June, 2001) defines a program as "a valid curriculum and major combination regardless of whether any students are currently registered in the program. While many curriculum/major permutations are possible, in practice only approximately 1/3 are utilized, i.e., have registered students" (p. 3). The following guidelines for identification of a program should be applied:

- A. A program is an intellectually coherent set of curricular offerings that produces a measurable intellectual outcome.
- B. A program is sufficiently distinct as to require specific faculty commitments to the program.
- C. A program usually represents a choice of focus for students within the department. Sometimes such a choice is characterized as among "divisions," "tracks," or "emphases."
- D. A program is separately identified in the undergraduate or graduate course catalog.

Note: This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of what may be considered in designating a program within a department; it should help the department head in considering program structure within a department. The Associate Provost will review each department's list of suggested programs for academic Program Review. The Associate Provost is the final arbiter of the list of programs.

The Program Review Schedule Cycle

Academic Program Reviews are based on a 10-year cycle. The reviews are scheduled in two four-year sequences, with a self-study for the North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Schools, and their subsequent visit and review, anchoring the cycle in the ninth and tenth years.

The 2001-2011 cycle of program review is outlined below:

Year	College	Department	# UG codes	# GR codes	Accreditation	
<b>2001-2002</b> <b>2005-2006</b>	<b>CAS</b>	Art	25	3	2002 Site Visit	
Geology and Geography		10	9			
Chemistry		9	1			
Psychology		2	5			
<b>COB</b>		Computer Information Systems	1	1		
<b>COE</b>		HPERD	8	6		
<b>CHHS</b>		Nursing	2	2		2002 Site Visit
<b>COT</b>	Interdisciplinary Technology	6	3			
<b>2003-2003</b> <b>2006-2007</b>	<b>CAS</b>	Foreign Languages & Bilingual Studies	15	6	2003 Site Visit	
Political Science		5	1			
SAC-Undergrad		8				
<i>All SAC in 2007-2008</i>						
Computer Science		2	1			
Mathematics		5	3			
<b>COB</b>		Business Admin	22	11		
Accounting & Finance		5	2			
<b>COE</b>		Teacher Education	7	17		2003 Site Visit
<b>CHHS</b>		None				
<b>COT</b>	Industrial Technology	8	6			

Year	College	Department	# UG codes	# GR codes	Accreditation
------	---------	------------	------------	------------	---------------

<b>2003-2004</b>					
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>CAS</b>	Communication & Theatre Arts	11	9	
		English & Lit	14	5	
		SAC-Graduate Programs		3	
		<i>All SAC in 2007-2008</i>			
		Biology	5	6	
	<b>COB</b>	Marketing	6		
	<b>COE</b>	Leadership & Counseling		6	2004 Site Visit
	<b>CHHS</b>	HECR	6	7	
		AHP	6	1	2004 Site Visit
	<b>COT</b>	Business & Tech. Ed.	12	4	
<b>2004-2005</b>					
<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>CAS</b>	African American Studies	1		
		Economics	3	4	
		History & Philosophy	8	3	
		Women's Studies	1	1	
		Music	5	5	
		Physics	6	3	
	<b>COB</b>	Management	4	1	2005 Site Visit
	<b>COE</b>	Special Education	8	7	
	<b>CHHS</b>	Social Work	1	5	
	<b>COT</b>	None			
<b>2009-2010</b>		Departmental NCA Self Study			
<b>2010-2011</b>		NCA Visit and Review			

The schedule of Program Review depends on a number of factors. Although the normal review schedule for each program will be every five years, a Program Review is optional in any year. When circumstances warrant, the Provost, Associate Provost, college dean, or the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research may request more frequent reviews of a program. All of a department's programs will conduct academic Program Reviews in the same academic year, unless exceptions are granted by the Provost. Where possible and appropriate, Program Review within a department will be

scheduled to coincide with an external accreditation review; program accreditation is neither the same as, nor a substitute for, the academic Program Review.

The Provost's Office is responsible for the Program Review schedule. The Associate Provost, in consultation with the college deans and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, will maintain the Program Review schedule. All requests for variance from the master schedule shall be addressed to the Provost. A minimum of a four-year master schedule of departments whose programs will be reviewed will be maintained at all times, with copies distributed to the college deans and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research at the beginning of each fiscal year.

### Guidelines for Program Review Reports

The following guidelines should be used in conducting Program Reviews. These guidelines should help (1) reduce the amount of documentation required in the Program Review progress and (2) focus the review on program goals, how well the program has done to date in meeting these goals, and the future actions needed to meet the goals. These guidelines are:

- A. The report will be goal oriented. Specific goals should be stated for the program and the attainment of those goals should be the focus of the program review report. The goals should reflect the university's mission and the departmental, college and divisional strategic plans. Goals for undergraduate programs and graduate programs will be separately identified
- B. The report will look at the program as a whole. The focus will be on the program, not on individual courses.
- C. The report will be forward-looking. It will focus not only on where the program has been but also on where the program wishes to go (its goals). Using data provided to or generated by the department, it will analyze and assess whether the goals are appropriate to the discipline, the needs of students in the program, etc.
- D. The focus of the report will be on assessment rather than on description. The report will evaluate progress toward program goals rather than merely document the status of the program. It will analyze available data, both quantitative and qualitative, that has been provided to or generated by the department, to assess the program's progress in meeting its goal. (For example, do responses from employers indicate the program is successfully preparing its graduates for the workplace, if such preparation is one of the goals of the program?)
- E. Recommendations will be expressed in terms of action. Recommendations for action will indicate who will do what specific tasks, and when.
- F. The Program Review process will be continuous. With appropriate input from faculty, monitoring will be conducted by the Department Head, the appropriate College Dean, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research and the Division of Academic Affairs.

The structure of the Program Review report is found at Appendix A.

### Components of the Program Review Process

The Program Review process is managed by the Associate Provost. The department head will be responsible for the conduct of a Program Review of all departmental programs, excluding minors. The writing of Program Review reports should be directed by the department head, with the full participation of the program faculty. According to the EMU AAUP 2000 contract, before faculty in any department are requested to undertake a Program Review they shall be provided with the details of the Program Review process, including the timetable for reviews and the criteria to be applied in reaching decisions to continue or discontinue programs. As the Program Review develops and is written, all program faculty should have ample time and opportunity to contribute to the Program Review in its draft form and as it will be submitted to the Provost.

The Program Review document should follow the outline presented in the section of this document headed Appendix A. The Program Review should conclude with specific recommendations regarding the future of each program: continuation (maintenance at current level); continuation with specific changes (expansion, downsizing, restructuring or merging with another program); probation; or phase out (elimination). The department head will write a departmental overview report and make specific recommendations regarding each program. Those recommendations should represent a consensus of program faculty and the department head. If there is disagreement, those differences will be stated as one, or more, minority reports attached to the Program Review document. It is essential that the main text of the Program Review document be succinct and not exceed 25 pages, excluding appendixes (per program). However, programs may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program.

The department head is responsible for forwarding the Program Review materials, supporting documents and final recommendations to the dean of the appropriate college. The dean will evaluate all Program Review materials and rate each program according to the following scale:

- (1) Continuation
- (2) Continuation with specific changes
- (3) Probation
- (4) Phase out

The dean's rating will reflect the program's viability, value, quality, effectiveness, and efficient use of resources. It will include not only a narrative justifying their recommended rating of the program, but also a recommendation to the Provost for any follow-up actions required.

The completed report will then be turned in to the Associate Provost for distribution to appropriate review entities. Those formal responses will, in turn, be submitted to the Associate Provost and taken into consideration.

The Associate Provost will follow up with, and facilitate, open discussions, including but not limited to, the Deans Advisory Council, department heads, program coordinators, and faculty, involved with each report, to address the responses generated. The emphasis of the meeting will be on validating observations and recommendations presented in the Program Review reports.

The Associate Provost will review the reports and all other materials submitted, will make recommendations, and will forward the reports, all other materials and his/her recommendations to the Provost for his/her decisions. The Associate Provost will notify

the deans, department heads, and program coordinators of his/her recommended ratings. Once the final decisions/ratings have been made, the Provost will notify the Associate Provost, deans, department heads, and program coordinators of his/her ratings.

While under development, Program Reviews, Post-Review Program Improvement reports, external reviews, departmental self-studies, and related reports will be regarded as confidential; essentially, documents should be distributed within defined communities and not be generally accessible to the University community or the general public.

### Explanation of Ratings

If the Provost assigns a Program Review rating of (1) Continuation, then the program will be reviewed in the four-year cycle, and no follow-up action will be required.

If the Provost assigns a (2) Continuation with Specific Changes, the program will remain on the four-year program review cycle, 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 will be to respond to the concerns highlighted in the Program Review final ratings, propose improvements, and develop a timeline for implementing the recommended improvements.

When the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is completed, the department head will send the report to the college dean. The college dean, after receipt and approval of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan, will determine that recommendations adopted in the report are consistent with the programs goals described in the Program Review.

Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is adopted, the department head will report to the dean quarterly, in writing, on progress made in the implementation of recommendations proposed in the report. After receiving progress reports from the department head, the dean will summarize these reports in discussion with the Provost. This information will be integrated into the report to the Board of Regents on the previous year's program reviews.

For programs that are placed on (3) Probation, the department head will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan within three months. The Plan will include a detailed timeline, not to exceed three years, to eliminate the deficiencies noted in the Program Review. The program will be reviewed annually until noted deficiencies are rectified.

When the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is ready to implement, the department head will send the report to the college dean. The College Dean, after receipt and approval of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan, will determine that recommendations adopted in the report are consistent with the programs goals described 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. This information will be integrated into the report to the Board of Regents on the previous year's program reviews.

If a program is recommended for (4) "Phase Out," the department head and departmental faculty, where the program is based, will be given 30 days to respond to the recommendation. After receiving this response, the Provost will determine whether the program should be phased out. If, at that time, the Provost determines that the program will be phased out, the department head will supervise the writing and implementation of a detailed transition plan, due to the Associate Provost no later than 30 days after a final decision is made. This plan should address the following:

- An appropriate method for dispersing, reallocating, or transferring current funds or other resources that may be specifically tied to the program.
- An outline of outstanding projects/commitments and how/when they will be completed.
- A timeline and plan for discontinuing new admissions, that at the same time allows students who are currently in the midst of the program to complete within the allowed time.
- An outline and a timeline for the administrative tasks that must be undertaken to officially end a program, in coordination with the office of Program and Catalog Maintenance.

If phase out is implemented, faculty will be reassigned, retrained, or terminated based on stipulations in the Eastern Michigan University AAUP contract. Once a Phase Out plan is adopted, the Dean will report to the Associate Provost, in writing, on progress made on the Phase Out action.

#### Annual Associate Provost's Report on Academic Programming

The Associate Provost, who is responsible for managing the Program Review process, will issue an annual report on academic programming at Eastern Michigan University, addressed to the Deans Advisory Council, the Provost, and the President. The report will delineate the Associate Provost's observations concerning the health of the academic programs at the University and will consider the issues of quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency, and resource value. It will also identify areas in which Academic Affairs expects an increased need for faculty, staff, and other resources.

#### Resource Allocation as a Result of Program Review

Academic Program Review results will have budgetary implications. According to the following guidelines, resources may be allocated, where appropriate and justified, for the improvement or enhancement of programs. Funding will be made separately for graduate and undergraduate programs. The Associate Provost may determine, subject to the approval of the Provost, the recipients of these allocations.

1. The Provost's office may provide funding for improving programs that have been recommended for Continuation with Specific Changes or for Probation.
2. Additional resources may be available for making good programs better.

#### Conclusion

Strong academic programs are the fundamental building blocks of a progressive, vibrant, and responsive learning environment. The purpose of Program Review is to enhance the learning environment of Eastern Michigan University, thereby maximizing each student and faculty member's opportunity for success.

## References

- Barak, R. J., and Breier, B. (1990). Successful Program Review. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barak, R. J., and Sweeney, J. D. (1995). *Academic Program Review in Planning, Budgeting, and Assessment*. New Directions in Institutional Research, 86, 3-18.
- Conrad, C. F., & Wilson, R. F. (1985). Academic Program Reviews: Institutional Approaches, Expectations, and Controversies. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) – ERIC Higher Education.
- Kells, H. R. (1989). *The Inadequacy of Performance Indicators for Higher Education: The Need for a More Comprehensive and Developmental Construct*. Higher Education Management, 2 (3), 258-270.
- Kells, H. R. (1995). Self-Study Processes: A guide to Self-Evaluation in Higher Education (4<sup>th</sup> edition). Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.
- Michael, S. O. (1998). *Restructuring U.S. Higher Education: Analyzing Models for Academic Program Review and Discontinuation*. The Review of Higher Education, 21(4), 377-404.
- Moniodis, Paul. The Eastern Michigan University Academic Department Profile 2000-2001.
- Satterlee, B. (1992). Program Review and Evaluation: A Survey of Contemporary Literature. (Eric Document No. ED 356261).
- University of North Florida (May, 2000). Academic program review homepage [Online]. Available: <http://www.unf.edu/acadaffairs/programreview.html> [July, 2000].
- Wergen, J. F. (December, 1999). *Evaluating Department Achievements: Consequences for the Work of Faculty*. AAHE Bulletin, 52, 3-6. [Online serial], 52. Available: <http://www.aahe.org/bulletin/dec99f1.html> [July, 2000].

## Appendix A

### The Structure of the Program Review Report

Program Name  
College  
Year of Report

#### I. GOALS

Describe the goals of the program. How and by whom were these goals determined? Have they changed since the last program review? If so, why and how? If not, why? How are these goals attained? What is the relationship of the goals to the University's mission, and the Departmental, College and Divisional strategic plans?

#### II. CURRICULUM

- A. Implementation of Goals. How does the program curriculum implement the goals and requirements of the program?
- B. Assessment and Evaluation. How do you assess the rigor, breadth, and currency of the degree requirements and curriculum? Describe the measures used to evaluate whether or not the program is meeting its goals. A fuller description of evidence from these measures will appear on the following pages.
- C. Relevance. Report evidence showing how the program responds to emerging issues in the discipline, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in student needs, etc.
- D. Integration of International and Multicultural Perspectives. Where applicable, describe how the program has incorporated multicultural and international perspectives into the curriculum.
- E. Non-Classroom Learning Opportunities. Indicate what international education, service learning, internship, independent study and research opportunities are available to undergraduates.
- F. Demand for Program Graduates. Not all programs are designed to prepare students for specific careers. Nevertheless, it is useful to know what program graduates do once they leave EMU. Discuss available information about program graduates. If applicable, indicate what percent of students find program-related employment within one year of completing the program? Who are the major employers of students who complete the program? Approximately what percent of students go on for additional education? Describe, if you know, where most students obtain further educational training.

Describe and report evidence of the value of the program. Include, wherever possible, the following measures:

1. Percent of graduates who are employed full-time in the field within one year of receiving their degree.
  2. Percent of graduates employed as part-time or temporary.
  3. Student ratings of career assistance provided by program faculty and staff.
  4. Geographic distribution of employed graduates.
  5. Career tracking over time.
    - a) Approximately what percent of students go on for additional educational training? Describe where most students obtain their future educational training.
    - b) If your program has a more general focus, include here some measures of program success in helping students to meet their goals for enrolling in the program. Why do students enroll? What do they expect the program to do for them? How well does the program meet their expectations?
- G. Reputations and Perceptions. Describe the acceptance rate of highly recruited students, the ratio of student applications to offers of admission, the ration of offers of admission to actual student enrollment in the program, as well as the reasons students gave for declining an offer of admission. Identify the main competitors we would like prospective students to compare us to and select us over.
- H. Degree Progress and Persistence. Describe and report data on student progress, including years to complete the degree, percent of entering cohorts completing the degree, phantoms (i.e., not on leave of absence, yet not currently registered or enrolled. How many students have graduated from the program in each of the last five years?
- I. Graduation Hours. How many hours are required for students to graduate in the program? What is the average number of hours students actually take to graduate? (Use data provided by the Associate Provost's Office.) Explain any discrepancies between required and actual hours for graduation.

### III. FACULTY

- A. Diversity. State the program's diversity goals for representation of both gender and ethnicity in the faculty. Indicate whether the program has met its diversity goals and describe efforts being made to attain or retain appropriate diversity.
- B. Teaching and Learning. Summarize and assess activities within the program that have attempted to improve the quality of the curriculum and the method of teaching the curriculum. Include departmental and individual efforts to improve the learning environment, add and use appropriate technology, training, increase in the number of undergraduate and graduate assistants, etc. In particular, describe efforts to promote a community of scholars (e.g. advising, mentoring. Interaction of students with faculty and peers, developmental efforts, seminars, workshops, guest lectures, special events, student participation in the Undergraduate Symposium and the Graduate Research Fair). What effects have these activities had on the quality of teaching and learning in the program? Give evidence for your response.
- C. Research. Summarize and assess the research and scholarly or, where appropriate, creative activities of program faculty, including sponsored projects. What percentage of faculty have published or presented professional papers since the last program review? How many program faculty have received external or internal awards for research since the last program review. Indicate the number and kinds of awards received include the amount of sponsored research dollars awarded to faculty in the program. Indicate whether the level of activity is satisfactory in each of these areas and if not, describe plans to increase the level of activity.
- D. Service to University (including department, college, and university-wide activities) /Community/Region/State.
1. Summarize and assess the service work of program faculty (include service to the university, accreditation bodies, and regional, state, and national professional associations).
  2. Summarize and assess other professional service, such as manuscript reviewing, service on editorial boards, etc.
  3. Describe and assess services performed by program faculty for extra-university general public groups (e.g., presentations in schools or to community organizations).

- E. Service to Students. How many and what percentage of program faculty server as dissertation chairs, thesis supervisors, committee members?

Describe actions taken by program faculty and staff to provide optimal service to students, e.g. advising, scheduling courses and office hours, assisting transfer students, etc. Report evidence showing how students perceive they are treated: surveys, student evaluations of faculty and courses, etc.

- F. Use of Lecturers. Describe the use of lecturers in the teaching of undergraduate classes that are part of the program, especially Continuing Education courses. Has each lecturer been evaluated by the Graduate School? What percentage of courses are taught by lecturers? What kinds of courses are they? Describe whether and why (or why not) the program considers the current use of lecturers to be appropriate.

- G. Reward Structure. Is the reward structure, currently in place, adequate to support faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service?

#### IV. STUDENT TRENDS

- A. Enrollment. Briefly explain and comment upon trends in program enrollment and degrees awarded. How many students are currently enrolled in the program? Describe the trends in enrollment since the last program review. Has enrollment increased or decreased? Describe the program's goals, strategy, and efforts to maintain/increase/decrease the number of students in the program, and to retain students in the program. What is the appropriate program size given the available faculty and physical resources?

Briefly describe and discuss student retention and graduation rates.

- B. Quality of Students. What have been the accomplishments of students in the program? Describe the awards students in the program have earned (e.g., scholarships, fellowships, etc.). Describe the number and percentage of students in the honors program. Describe outstanding scholarly/creative activities of students in the program (e.g., Undergraduate Symposium presentations, other presentations or awards). What is the average GPA of students graduating from the program?

Describe the measures used to assess the quality of students entering the program. Describe the average undergraduate grade point average for entering graduate students, the average standardized test score, and awards entering graduate students may have earned (e.g., scholarships, fellowships, grants). Describe the creative and scholarly activity of the graduate students in the program (e.g., participation in the Graduate Research Fair, conference presentations, publications, etc.). Attach an appendix that lists those activities.

- C. Grading Trends. As a result of the 1990 NCA evaluation, EMU was asked to monitor its grading trends. Accordingly, grade distribution data for each course are provided to departments. Analyze the grade distributions for the courses in your program over the past five years, and comment on trends.

- D. Student Satisfaction. Describe and report on student satisfaction with courses, instructors, advisers, faculty mentors, library, research facilities, and the

relevance of training to future employment. Where applicable, describe and report data on student satisfaction with field placements and practicums. Use the Student Course Rating data, published annually by the University, as well as the results of student surveys.

- E. Financial Aid. Identify the support available from the Graduate School or department (fellowships, endowed scholarships, assistantships, etc.) and the number of students receiving the support. Is the support available sufficient to recruit the best students and keep them enrolled?

## V. SERVICE COURSES

This is not intended to be a review of general education or other service courses in themselves, but rather an assessment of the impact that delivery of service courses has on a program.

- A. Provision of Courses. Recognizing that the provision of service courses is often a departmental rather than a program responsibility, describe where possible and relevant, the program's role in providing General Education and service courses for other departments and colleges at EMU. Indicate, if possible, the percentage of program resources that are used to provide service courses. What, service courses, if any, are also program requirements?
- B. Issues. Describe issues for the program related to providing both service courses or courses for other programs. What contact is there between the program and the department or program provided the service courses? Indicate whether the program plans to increase, decrease, or keep constant its level of service courses and the reasons for this decision. How do service courses impact program delivery?

## VI. PROGRAM DELIVERY

- A. Recruitment. Describe the marketing and recruiting plan that is currently in place and the recruiting activities that have taken place since the last review. Describe the recruiting activities of the program at university-sponsored activities. Describe any additional recruitment activities of faculty or students in the program. What resources are needed to market and recruit more effectively?
- B. Accessibility. Describe the program's actions to make itself accessible and the role of accessibility in recruiting students. Describe how the program's scheduling of classes affirms and advances program goals and programmatic priorities (e.g., scheduling of more sections of high-demand classes and flexible scheduling of spring, summer, and evening classes). Identify factors that hamper these efforts.
- C. Instructional Technology. Describe the present and planned use of technology to enhance instruction. Describe any existing acquisition plan. What are the most serious technological needs of the program? Does an acquisition plan currently exist? Identify obstacles to the acquisition or use of technology in instruction.

- D. Continuing Education. Describe the program's use of Continuing Education (including distance learning, where appropriate) to deliver instruction and serve the needs of students. Describe future efforts including remote site plans and use of the Internet. What measures are in place to insure quality in distance learning courses and programs?
- E. Capstone projects/theses/dissertations. Describe current requirements for capstone projects/theses/dissertations. If a thesis is optional, what percentage of students complete a thesis?
- F. Assessment. Describe the program's progress in implementing its plan to assess student achievement and report available results. Describe the assessment measures/techniques used to verify that graduating students have mastered the key skills and concepts of the discipline. Describe the conclusions derived from the assessment data.

## VII. OUTREACH

- A. Advisory Committees. Describe how the program uses advisory committees or efforts made to establish advisory committees.
- B. Alumni. Describe efforts to contact alumni and involve them in program activities. Report the results of any survey of program graduates. Describe their satisfaction with the program and their suggestions for improvement. Describe how their occupations relate to the program.

- C. Fundraising/Development. Describe the contacts developed and maintained and successes achieved in obtaining gifts from private concerns, governmental agencies, alumni, and the community or general public.

## VIII. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Identify, discuss, and provide benchmarking information regarding 3-4 programs from outside institutions. Their programs would be comparable in such aspects as educational mission, university setting, and educational objectives. You may consider them to be your competition. Why is this? How do they achieve their educational mission? How effective are their techniques? What is successful and what is not? Compare and contrast these types of concepts with those of your program.

## IX. RESOLUTION OF ISSUES

- A. Accreditation. Programs with external accrediting bodies are governed by the standards established by those professional accreditation organizations. If the program has special accreditation (e.g., American Chemical Society, National Association of Schools of Music, National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education), or state assessment (e.g., Michigan teacher education or professional organizations such as ACS, SSQ, etc.), describe any issues or concerns that were identified in the last external review report. Describe how the program has responded to each issue/concern. Describe how the program has implemented, or plans to implement each recommendation. Describe identified strengths of the program.
- B. External Review. Programs without accrediting agencies may be reviewed by experts within the discipline from other institutions who will employ accepted disciplinary standards in conducting their reviews. If an outside evaluator (not an employee of EMU) was employed as part of the Program Review process, append the reviewer's credentials. Describe the evaluator's recommendations and indicate if and how the program plans to implement them.
- C. Internal Review. Describe any recommendations that were made by the department, the Dean, and/or the Provost in the last internal Program Review. Describe how the program has responded to each issue/concern. Describe how the program plans to implement the recommendations.
- D. Impact of Response to Issues/Concerns. Describe the impact (or expected impact) of the program's responses to these recommendations on program faculty, curricula, research initiatives, student enrollment and student services.

## X. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

- A. What steps should be taken to strengthen the program? How can program quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency and resource values be improved?
- B. Should the program be expanded, maintained at the current level, downsized, eliminated, restructured, or merged with another program? This

recommendation should represent a consensus of program faculty and the department head. Unresolved differences in viewpoints will be expressed as one or more minority reports attached to the program review document. The focus should be on how the program can be improved.

## XI. APPENDICES

Programs may provide additional materials in the form of supplementary narratives, data, or evidence if they believe such additional material will enhance understanding of the character and circumstance of the program.

## **Appendix B**

### **Departmental Overview**

Department Name

College

Year of Report

#### **I. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.**

- A. Programmatic.
- B. Faculty.
- C. Enrollment.

#### **II. PROGRAMMING PHILOSOPHY**

- A. Why are these particular programs offered?
- B. How do they fit within the department?
- C. Describe the interface with other departments on campus.
- D. What is their relationship to the University Mission and Strategic Plan?

#### **III. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS**

- A. How was the report developed?
- B. Who wrote the report?
- C. How was workload addressed within the department?
- D. How long did the process take?
- E. What suggestions do you have to improve the process for your department?

#### IV. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

- A. List the strengths and weaknesses of each program and describe how they interact within the department.
- B. How well is the department funded to achieve its educational goals?
- C. What improvements can be made?

#### V. COST EFFECTIVENESS

- A. Instructional cost per credit hour and cost per section credit hour (available in Department Profile reports).
- B. Trends.
- C. Budget information.
- D. Identify cost or funding concerns.

#### VI. ISSUES AND CONCERNS

- A. Identify specific needs the department or a specific program may have.
- B. Discuss ongoing issues and concerns that the department must deal with on a frequent or regular basis.
- C. Share any suggestions or solutions to handle these areas.

## **Appendix C**

### **Dean's Summary, Ratings, and Recommendations**

College

Year of Report Program Review reports

#### **I. CONFIRM THAT THE REPORTS ARE COMPLETE.**

A. Departmental Overview should include:

- 1) How was the report compiled?
  - a. Who wrote it?
- 2) Goals and Objectives.
- 3) Programming philosophy.
- 4) Strengths & weaknesses.
- 5) Issues & concerns.

#### **II. CONFIRM THE VALIDITY OF THE REPORTS.**

#### **III. EVALUATE ALL MATERIALS TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDED PROGRAM RATINGS.**

A. Ratings will reflect:

- 1) Viability.
- 2) Value.
- 3) Quality.
- 4) Effectiveness.
- 5) Efficient use of resources.

B. Ratings:

1) Continuation.

- a. Program will be reviewed in a 5 yr. cycle with no follow up required.
- b. Continuation with specific changes.
- c. Program will remain on the 5 yr. Cycle.
- d. Dept. Head will supervise the writing of a Post-Review Improvement Plan within 3 months of the receipt of the rating.

2) Probation.

- a. Department Head will supervise the writing of a Post-Review Improvement Plan within 3 months.
- b. Will include a detailed timeline to eliminate the deficiencies noted.

(1) *Not to exceed 3 yrs.*

- c. Program will then be reviewed annually until the noted deficiencies are rectified.

3) Phase out.

- a. Department Head and faculty will be given 30 days to respond to recommendation.
- b. A timeline and supporting plan will be developed to stop admissions to the program and end date the program appropriately and as expeditiously as possible.

IV. NARRATIVE JUSTIFYING RECOMMENDED RATING, INCLUDING  
RECOMMENDED FOLLOW UP ACTIONS.

## **Appendix D**

### **The Structure of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan**

Program Name

College or Graduate School

Year of Report

#### **VII. SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEW RATING AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A. Describe the Program that was reviewed.
- B. State the recommendations that were made for the program.
- C. State any difference in recommendations made by the Dean, the Associate Provost, or the Provost.

#### **VIII. ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROGRAM REVIEW**

- A. Which recommendations from the program review are to be adopted? If different, which recommendations from the Dean, the Associate Provost, or the Provost, will be adopted? State the rationale for not adopting any recommendation.
- B. Indicate which planned changes in the program derive all or in part from the program review, a prior departmental review, or an external review. When possible, reference document cited by page and line number.
- C. Describe the corrective actions that program faculty want to take. Is there a consensus concerning the corrective changes that need to be taken? Include the views from those who could not reach a consensus in a supporting addendum.

#### **IX. STEPS TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A. Provide a timeline of changes that will occur in the program.
- B. Describe the steps that can be implemented immediately to improve the program. Explain each of these steps in detail and identify the individual/committee that will oversee each step.
- C. Outline the steps that can be completed by the end of one year, and after years two and three. Describe each step and identify the person/committee that will be responsible for each step.
- D. Express the long-term outcomes expected in five years if the program improvement plan is successful. What long-term outcomes are expected in 10 years?

#### **X. RESOURCE REALLOCATION**

- A. Describe any internal program resources that will need to be reallocated in order to implement the adopted recommendations. Describe the implications of resource reallocation for other programs within the department.
- B. Describe any external resources that will be needed in order to implement the adopted recommendations.

XI. ASSESSMENT OF THE POST-REVIEW PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- A. The program improvement plan will need to specify program outcomes to evaluate whether the plan successfully corrects the problem(s) identified in the Program Review. State the outcomes that define a successful or unsuccessful outcome, in addition to the expected outcome. Describe how the outcome of the adopted program changes will be evaluated.
- B. Describe how incorporation of the improvement will strengthen the program. Explain how program quality, productivity, satisfaction, and resource value will be improved.
- C. Describe how the program will implement more effective outcome assessment measures to improve program quality and enhance the educational experience of students in the program.