

**EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**PROGRAM REVIEW
DEPARTMENT MANUAL**



EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

2001-2011
2004-2005 Update

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Definition and Purpose of Program Review	3
Philosophy of Program Review	3
Types of Program Reviews	4
Recent History of Program Review at Eastern Michigan University.	4
Goals of Program Review	5
Successful Program Review	5
Assumptions Undergirding the Academic Program Review System	6
Determination of Programs in a Department	6
The Program Review Schedule Cycle	7
Guidelines for Program Review Reports.	9
Components of the Program Review Process.	10
Explanation of Ratings	11
Program Review Annual Report	13
Resource Allocation as a Result of Program Review	14
Conclusion	14
References	15
Appendix A: The Structure of the Program Review Report	16
Appendix B: Departmental Overview	27
Appendix C: Dean’s Summary, Ratings, and Recommendations	29
Appendix D: The Structure of the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan	31

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:

- To provide structure, a plan of action, and information that enhances continuous quality improvement.
- To strengthen academic programs deemed to be of high quality and that are closely aligned with Eastern Michigan University's mission.
- To identify and support programs capable of maintaining or increasing student enrollments.
- To tie the budget process to Program Review results to maximize the use of limited resources.
- 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.
- To discontinue programs that are no longer making essential contributions to the institutional mission.

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:

- Formative Review – The primary responsibility for the review rests with the faculty connected with the program.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 table represents 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

In 1998, for several reasons, 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, Michael Harris. The revision implemented ideas taken from exemplary program review systems at other universities (e.g., University of Northern Florida, 2000) and from recent program review literature (Wergin, 1999).

The Program Review Departmental Manual was rewritten and subsequently updated. It currently includes guidelines for the identification of programs within a department, a description of the Program Review and the post-review process, as well as templates for the Program Review report, the Departmental Overview, and the Dean's Summary Ratings and Recommendations, and the Post-Review Improvement Plan.

The Program Review process requires separate reviews of all programs, both graduate and undergraduate, within a department in the same year. 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 Associate Provost is responsible for overall management of the program review process.

Goals of Program Review

The institutional goals of Program Review:

- Evaluate the viability, value, quality, effectiveness, and efficient use of resources for each of the academic programs at Eastern Michigan University.
- Integrate to the fullest extent possible program review and assessment activities with student outcomes and accreditation self-studies.
- Contribute to the University's effort to build a culture of academic quality and excellence.
- Provide direction and priorities for the University that can be used for needs assessment, resource allocation, and planning.
- 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, while at the same time generating meaningful planning and accountability. It should also document the ways in which each program contributes to achieving 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:

- Interest and leadership by department heads, deans, and vice presidents.
- A decision-making process that fits the institutional environment.
- Simple and readily understandable structures and policies.
- Attention to each element of the decision-making process.
- 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:

- The academic Program Review process requires accurate, consistent, and current data. The data sets 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 are not. The Division of Academic Affairs will maintain an academic program review schedule of department and interdisciplinary programs for the next ten years.

This schedule does not indicate programs offered within each department. The Division of Academic Affairs will ask each scheduled 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 forwarded 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 program is an intellectually coherent set of curricular offerings that produces a measurable intellectual outcome.
- A program is sufficiently distinct as to require specific faculty commitments to the program.
- 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."
- A program is separately identified in the undergraduate or graduate course catalog.

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

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 campus 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 reports	# GR reports	Accreditation
2001-2002	CAS	Art	5	3	2002 Site Visit
2005-2006		Chemistry	9	1	
		Geology & Geography	6	2	
		Psychology	2	3	
Year	College	Department	# UG reports	# GR reports	Accreditation
	COB	Computer Information Systems	1	1	
	COE	HPERD	6	1	
	CHHS	Nursing	2	3	2002 Site Visit
	COT	Interdisciplinary Technology	6	2	
2003-2003	CAS	Computer Science	2	2	

2006-2007		Foreign Languages & Bilingual Studies	13	7	
		Political Science	6	1	2003 Site Visit
		SAC-Undergrad	4		
		<i>All SAC in 2007-2008</i> Mathematics	5	4	
COB		Accounting & Finance	3	1	
		Business Admin	2	4	
COE		<i>Teacher Education moved to 05-06</i>	7	17	2003 Site Visit
CHHS		None			
COT		Industrial Technology	12	5	
2003-2004 2007-2008	CAS	Biology	6	6	
		Communication & Theatre Arts	7	4	
		English & Literature	11	5	
		SAC-Graduate Programs <i>All SAC in 2007-2008</i>		3	
COB		Marketing	1		
COE		Leadership & Counseling		6	2004 Site Visit
CHHS		AHP	3	3	2004 Site Visit
		HECR	4	4	
COT		Business & Tech. Ed.	9	3	

Year	College	Department	# UG reports	# GR reports	Accreditation
2004-2005	CAS	African Am. Studies	1		
2008-2009		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	
		Teacher Education	7	17	2003 Site Visit
	CHHS	Social Work	1	5	
	COT	None			
2009-2010		Departmental NCA Self Study			
2010-2011		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 four 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. 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:

1. 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

2. The report will look at the program as a whole. The focus will be on the program, not on individual courses.
3. 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.
4. 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 goals. (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?)
5. Recommendations will be expressed in terms of action. Recommendations for action will indicate who will do what specific tasks, and when.
 - 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 executing Program Review for 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 reports are developed and 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 Appendix A. The Program Review report should conclude with specific recommendations and future plans for each program. The department head will write a departmental overview report and make specific recommendations regarding each program (*see Appendix B*). 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 per program, excluding appendices. In the 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.

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, which will be discussed later in this document:

- (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 the recommended program rating, but also a recommendation to the Provost for any follow-up actions required (*see Appendix C*).

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, taken into consideration, and used to guide the agenda for the Roundtable Discussions.

The Associate Provost will follow up with and facilitate open discussions, including but not limited to, the Deans Advisory Council, department heads, program coordinators, faculty, and other interested parties involved with each report. The emphasis of the meeting will be on validating observations and recommendations presented in the Program Review reports, and clarifying or responding to comments generated from other campus entities.

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

While under development, Program Reviews, Post-Review Program Improvement Plans, 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

The Program Review process will result in one of four ratings for each program:

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

The Provost will assign a rating to all participating programs at the close of each rotation of Program Review. The ratings assigned by the Provost will include specific follow up actions and due dates. Each rating requires a different level of follow up, outlined below:

(1) Continuation

If the Provost assigns a Program Review rating of *(1) Continuation*, the program will be reviewed in the four-year cycle, and no specific follow-up action will be required, aside from normal continuous improvement activities.

(2) Continuation with specific changes

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 will determine if recommendations adopted in

the report are consistent with the programs goals described in the Program Review and the requirements assigned by the Provost, deciding if the plan should be approved and implemented.

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

(3) Probation

For programs that are rated (3) *Probation*, the department head and departmental faculty, where the program is based, will be given 30 days to respond, in writing, to the Provost. If it is decided that the program will go on 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.

When the Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is completed, the department head will send the report to the college dean. The college dean will determine if recommendations adopted in the report are consistent with the programs goals described in the Program Review and the requirements assigned by the Provost, deciding if the plan should be approved and implemented.

Once a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan is approved, the program staff will have direct access to Academic Programming staff, including the Academic Programs Analyst; Director for Course and Program Development; Director for Program and Catalog Maintenance; and Director for Undergraduate Studies, to assist where needed with implementation of the plan. Those programs in need of assistance will be a priority for the services of Academic Program staff.

The program will also conduct Program Review ***annually*** until noted deficiencies are rectified. The dean will report to the Associate Provost quarterly, in writing, on progress made in the implementation of the Post-Review Improvement Plan. 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 a report to the Board of Regents on the previous year's program reviews.

(4) Phase Out

If a program is rated (4) *Phase Out*, the department head and departmental faculty, where the program is based, will be given 30 days to respond, in writing, to the Provost. 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 and commitments and how and when they will be resolved.
- A timeline and plan for discontinuing new admissions that at the same time allows students who are currently in the program to complete it within the allowed time.
- In coordination with the office of Program and Catalog Maintenance, an outline and a timeline for the administrative tasks that must be undertaken to officially end a program.

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 quarterly, in writing, on progress made on the phase out action. 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 a report to the Board of Regents on the previous year's program reviews.

Program Review Annual Report

The Associate Provost, who is responsible for managing the Program Review process, will issue an annual report on academic programming at Eastern Michigan University. The report will be presented to the Board of Regents at the fall meeting. It will also be distributed to the President, the Provost, Deans Advisory Council, and department heads.

The annual report will summarize the year's activities; give an update on follow up activities from prior years; set goals for the upcoming year; and present the Associate Provost's observations concerning the health of the academic programs at the University. It 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

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. The Associate Provost may determine, subject to the approval of the Provost, the recipients of these allocations.

- The Provost's office may provide funding for improving programs that have been recommended for Continuation with Specific Changes or for Probation.
- 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. (1995). Self-Study Processes: A guide to Self-Evaluation in Higher Education (4th 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

The outline below should be used as a template for the Program Review report. Each program in the department will write a separate report that in some way addresses every main topic area below. It is recognized there are some questions or issues that are not appropriate to every program and that some information may “fit” better in a different section for some programs. The questions and areas of focus provide guidance as to the general nature of the information that should be provided in the report.

- I. GOALS.** Describe and evaluate the goals of the program.
- A. How and by whom were the goals established?
 - B. Have the goals changed since the last program review? If so, why and how? If not, why not?
 - C. How are the goals attained?
 - D. What is the relationship of the goals to the University’s mission, and the Departmental, College and Divisional strategic plans?
 - E. Are the goals student driven?
 - F. How do the goals apply to the community/region/marketplace?
- II. CURRICULUM**
- A. Implementation of Goals. Describe and assess how the curriculum implements the goals of the program.
- B. Program requirements. Describe and assess the current program requirements.
1. What are the requirements of the current program? Include all required and elective courses, as well as any hidden prerequisites and required general education courses.
 2. When was the last time that the program was significantly revised?
 3. Are there plans to revise the current program within the next three to five years? Why or why not?
 4. Are there currently any curricular or program changes currently in the Course and Program Development system?
- C. Graduation Hours. Describe and assess the number of credit hours students in the program take.
1. How many hours are required for students to graduate in the program? Include the entire program (e.g. general education requirements; pre-requisites; co-requisites; hidden pre-requisites; etc.)
 2. What is the average number of hours students actually take to graduate? (Use data provided by the Associate Provost’s Office.)
 3. If there are discrepancies between required and actual hours for graduation, how can they be explained?

- D. Degree Progress and Persistence. Describe and assess the ability of the program to retain and graduate qualified students.
1. How many students have graduated from the program in each of the last three to five years? Report and analyze available data.
 2. What percent of entering cohorts complete the degree? Report and analyze available data.
 3. How many years does it take the average student to complete the degree? Report and analyze available data.
- E. Relevance. Describe and assess how the program responds to emerging issues in the discipline, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in student needs, etc.
- F. Reputations and Perceptions. Describe and assess the program's ability to attract qualified students.
1. How successful is the program in attracting qualified students?
 2. Describe the acceptance rate of highly recruited students, the ratio of student applications to offers of admission, the ratio of offers of admission to actual student enrollment in the program, as well as the reasons students have given for declining an offer of admission.
 3. Why do students come to EMU for the program?
 4. What institutions are our main competitors for prospective students?
- G. 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. Describe and assess the current demand for program graduates.
1. What information about program graduates is currently available?
 2. What percent of students find program-related employment within one year of completing the program?
 3. Who are the major employers of students who complete the program?
 4. Approximately what percent of students go on for additional education?
 5. Where do most students obtain further educational training?
- H. Integration of International and Multicultural Perspectives. Describe and assess how the program incorporates multicultural and international perspectives into the curriculum or otherwise achieves a greater degree of diversity or inclusiveness in the content and pedagogy of instruction.
- I. Non-Classroom Learning Opportunities. Describe and assess any international education, service learning, internship, independent study and research opportunities that are available to students.

- J. Assessment and Evaluation. Describe and evaluate the program's assessment mechanisms.
1. How do you assess the rigor, breadth, and currency of the degree requirements and curriculum?
 2. What measures are used to evaluate whether or not the program is meeting its goals?
 3. Based on these measures, are the goals being reached?
- K. Program Value. Describe and assess the value of the program.
1. How do you assess the value of the program?
 2. How do students rate career assistance?
 3. What percent of graduates are employed full-time in the field within one year of receiving their degree?
 4. What percent of graduates are employed as part-time or temporary in the field within one year of receiving their degree?
 5. What percent of graduates continue to be employed in the field?
 6. What is the geographic distribution of employed graduates?
 7. What percent of students go on for additional educational training?
 8. Where do most students obtain their additional educational training?
 9. If students' primary reason for enrolling in the program are neither job nor educationally related, what do they expect the program to do for them?
 10. How well does the program meet their expectations?
- L. Service Courses. Describe and assess the impact that delivery of service courses has on the program. Note that either a program or a department may offer service courses. If the program offers the courses, it should be included in the program report. If the department offers the courses, they may be discussed either in the department overview, or as a stand alone report.
1. Does the program provide general education and service courses for other departments and colleges at EMU?
 2. What service courses, if any, are also requirements for the program?
 3. Does the program provide either service courses or required courses for other programs?
 4. What contact is there with the department or program for which the service or required courses are provided?
 5. What impact does the provision of such courses have on the program?
 6. What percentage of program resources are used to provide service courses?
 7. Does the program plan to increase, decrease, or keep constant its level of service courses? Why?

III. FACULTY

- A. Composition. List all faculty, their qualifications and rank, and the tenure-track distribution within the program (or department if faculty typically teach across programs).
1. Describe and assess the current composition of program faculty.
 2. What is the normal teaching load in the program (or department)?
 3. What activities are faculty compensated with release time for?

4. What is the normal recruiting process for new faculty?
 5. Does the existing salary structure have an impact on the program's ability to recruit and retain quality faculty?
 6. Do new faculty participate in an orientation?
 7. What are the program's diversity goals for both gender and ethnicity in the faculty?
 8. What efforts are being made to attain or retain an appropriate level of diversity in the faculty?
 9. Has the program met its diversity goals?
 10. Is the reward structure currently in place adequate to support faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service?
 11. Is enhancing diversity and inclusion a component of the reward structure?
 12. What are the program's (or department's) criteria for graduate faculty?
 13. Have all graduate faculty met the criteria? Provide a list of those meeting the criteria in the Appendix.
 14. How does the program (or department) typically use lecturers?
 15. What are the program's (or department's) criteria for lecturers?
 16. Have all lecturers met the criteria? If not, what is being done to resolve the situation?
 17. Has each lecturer been evaluated by the Graduate School when appropriate?
 18. What percent of courses is taught by lecturers?
 19. What specific courses are they teaching?
 20. How long are their appointments?
 21. Does the program consider the current use of lecturers to be appropriate? Why or why not?
 22. If the program is accredited, what is the position of the accrediting body regarding the use of lecturers?
- B. Teaching. Describe and assess activities within the program that have attempted to improve the quality and method of teaching the curriculum.
1. What departmental and individual efforts have been made to improve the learning environment, add and use appropriate technology, training, increase in the number of undergraduate and graduate assistants, etc.?
 2. What types of professional development have faculty participated in, in efforts to enhance the learning environment? (e.g. Writing Across the Curriculum; Academic Service Learning; American Humanics; Diversity in the Curriculum; grant-writing workshops; etc.)
 2. What efforts have been made to increase the interaction of students with faculty and peers? Include such items as developmental activities, seminars, workshops, guest lectures, special events, student participation in the Undergraduate Symposium and the Graduate Research Fair.
 3. What efforts have been made to promote a community of scholars?
 4. To what extent are teaching and learning informed by current research and practice regarding inclusive pedagogy and curriculum?
 5. What effects have these activities had on the quality of teaching and learning in the program? Give evidence for your response.

- C. Research. Describe and assess the research and scholarly or creative activities of program faculty, including sponsored projects. Faculty vita may be enclosed in the Appendices of either the program report or the Departmental Overview; which ever is more appropriate to the presentation of the materials.
1. What percentage of faculty have published or presented professional papers since the last program review?
 2. How many program faculty have received external or internal awards for research since the last program review?
 3. How many and what types of awards have faculty received? Include the amount of sponsored research dollars awarded to faculty in the program.
 4. To what extent does the research or creative activity of the department reflect attention to the challenge of achieving a more diverse and inclusive body of knowledge?
 5. Is the level of research or creative activity in each area satisfactory? If it is not, what steps are being planned to increase these activities?
- D. Service.
1. University.
 - a) What services have faculty provided to the university, accreditation bodies, and regional, state, and national professional associations?
 - b) What other professional services, such as manuscript reviewing, service on editorial boards, etc., have faculty provided?
 - c) What services for extra-university general public groups (e.g., presentations in schools or to community organizations) have faculty provided?
 - d) Is the level of service in each of these areas satisfactory? If it is not, what steps are being planned to increase these activities?
 2. Students.
 - a) What actions (e.g., advising, scheduling courses and office hours, assisting transfer students, etc.) have been taken by program faculty and staff to provide optimal service to students?
 - b) Have these activities been successful? Include evidence showing how students perceive they are treated (e.g., surveys, student evaluations of faculty and courses, etc.).
 - c) How many and what percentage of program faculty serve as dissertation chairs, thesis supervisors, committee members?
 - d) Is the level of service to students satisfactory? If it is not, what steps are being planned to increase service to students?

IV. STUDENT TRENDS

- A. Demographics. Describe the students in your program.
1. What is their gender, ethnicity, and age?
 2. Are they resident or non-resident students?
 3. Are they traditional or commuter students?
 4. Where do they live?
 5. Are they full-time or part-time students?
 6. Do they attend classes during the day, in the evenings, or on weekends?

7. Do they attend classes on main campus, at an off-site, or online?
8. Do they work? Full-time or part-time?
9. What is their socio-economic status?
10. How do these factors impact the curriculum, scheduling, and/or delivery method?

B. Enrollment.

1. Describe and assess trends in program enrollment and degrees awarded.
2. What is the appropriate program size given the available faculty, physical resources, and funding?
4. How many students are currently enrolled in the program?
5. Has enrollment increased or decreased since the last program review? Comment on any trends.
6. What are the program's current goals, strategy, and efforts to maintain/increase/decrease the number of students in the program?
7. What percentage of students who enroll in the program graduate from it? Comment on any trends.
8. What are the program's current goals, strategy and efforts to retain students in the program?
9. How many students apply to the program?
10. Of those who apply, how many and what percentage are admitted?
11. Of those who are admitted, how many and what percentage enroll?
12. Of those who enroll, how many and what percentage graduate?

C. Quality of Students. Describe and assess the quality of students in the program.

1. What measures are used to assess the quality of students entering the program?
2. What is the average GPA of students graduating from the program?
3. What number and percentage of students in the program are in the honors program?
4. What academic awards (i.e., scholarships, fellowships, etc.) have students in the program earned?
5. What scholarly/creative activities (e.g., Undergraduate Symposium presentations, other presentations or awards) have students in the program participated in?
6. What are other accomplishments of students in the program?
7. For graduate programs:
 - a) What is the average undergraduate grade point average and standardized test score for entering students?
 - b) What awards (e.g., scholarships, fellowships, grants) have entering graduate students earned?
 - c) What creative and scholarly activity (e.g., participation in the Graduate Research Fair, conference presentations, publications, etc.) have the graduate students in the program participated in? Attach an appendix that lists those activities.

D. Grading Trends. This section addresses the concept of grade inflation. Using the grade distribution data for each course that has been provided, analyze the grade distributions for the courses in your program over the past five years. Comment on any trends.

E. Student Satisfaction.

1. Using the Student Course Rating data published annually by the University, as well as the results of student surveys, describe and assess student satisfaction with courses, instructors, advisors, campus services, faculty mentors, library, research facilities, and the relevance of training to future employment.
2. Where applicable, describe and assess data on student satisfaction with field placements, practicums, internships, and career advising.

F. Financial Aid. Describe and assess the financial aid available to students.

1. What financial support (i.e., fellowships, endowed scholarships, assistantships, etc.) is available from the department or Graduate School?
2. How many students receive support?
3. Is the support available sufficient to recruit the best students and keep them enrolled?
4. What is the program doing to increase financial support for students?

V. PROGRAM DELIVERY

A. Accessibility and Scheduling. Describe and assess the program's actions to make itself accessible to students.

1. What role does accessibility play in recruiting students?
2. How does the program's scheduling of classes (e.g., scheduling of more sections of high-demand classes and flexible scheduling of spring, summer, evening, off-site, and online classes) affirm and advance program goals and programmatic priorities?
3. What factors hamper these efforts?

B. Instructional Technology. Describe and assess the programs present and future use of technology.

1. How does the present and planned use of technology enhance instruction?
2. What are the most serious technological needs of the program?
3. Does an acquisition plan to address these needs currently exist?
4. What are the obstacles to acquiring or using technology in instruction?
5. What impact do these obstacles have on the program?

C. Continuing Education. Describe and assess the program's current and future use of Continuing Education to deliver instruction and serve the needs of students.

1. What elements of the program are currently offered through Continuing Education?
2. Is the entire program currently offered at an off-site, online, out-of-state, or internationally?
3. Are there plans to offer the entire program at an off-site, online, out-of-state, or internationally?
4. If not, what elements of the program are currently offered or are planned to be offered at an off-site, online, out-of-state, or internationally?
5. If the entire program is offered online, is it also available on campus or is it available only on line?
6. Has the program responded appropriately to SEVIS regulations regarding online courses and international student participation?

7. Has the delivery method and/or location (if not on main campus) been approved by the North Central Association?
 8. What measures are in place to ensure quality in distance learning courses and other programs offered through Continuing Education?
 9. Are there plans to increase the program's involvement with Continuing Education?
- D. Capstone projects/theses/dissertations/courses. Describe and assess current requirements for capstone projects/theses/dissertations/courses.
1. Does the program currently require a capstone project/thesis/dissertation/course? If not, is such an experience optional?
 2. If a capstone project/thesis/dissertation/course is optional, what percentage of students complete it?
- E. Assessment. Describe and assess the program's progress in implementing its plan to assess student achievement.
1. What assessment measures/techniques are used to verify that graduating students have mastered the key skills and concepts of the discipline?
 2. What conclusions, regarding the success of the program in graduating students who have mastered these skills and concepts, can be derived from the current assessment data?
- F. Facilities. Describe and evaluate the current status of the program's facilities.
1. Are current classrooms, labs, technology, library services, off-site locations and online services adequate?
 2. How does the condition of facilities impact program delivery?
 3. What are the projected needs?
 4. Describe how changes or improvements to facilities will enhance program delivery?

VI. OUTREACH

- A. Website. Describe and assess the quality of the program Web site.
1. What is its purpose?
 2. Is it current?
 3. How often is it updated?
 4. Is it intuitive?
 5. Does it answer basic questions?
 6. Are there user friendly links to student services, etc.?
 7. Has there been any effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the website in terms of marketing and recruiting efforts?
- B. Marketing and recruiting. Describe and assess the program's marketing and recruiting efforts.
2. Does the program currently have a marketing and recruiting plan in place?
 3. What types of recruiting activities does the program participate in?
 4. How does the program engage in recruiting activities at university-sponsored events?
 5. What resources does the program need to market and recruit more effectively?

- C. Articulation Agreements. Describe and assess any articulation agreements with other institutions (both domestic and international).
1. Does the program participate in any articulation agreements with regional community colleges? If so, what are they and with which institutions?
 2. Does the program participate in any articulation agreements with colleges or universities outside the United States? If so, what are they and with which institutions?
 3. How many enrollments have the agreements yielded?
 4. What resources are involved in administering and maintaining these agreements?
 5. What impact do they have on the program or the department?
 6. What is the nature of the relationship between the program and Community College Relations?
- D. Student Organizations and Clubs. Describe and assess the non classroom opportunities available to students.
1. Does the program sponsor any student organizations or clubs? If so, what are they?
 2. What opportunities for students do these organizations or clubs provide?
 3. How are they linked to academic activities?
 4. What impact do they have on the program?
- E. Community Activities and Involvement. Describe and assess the program's community involvement.
1. Does the program participate in community activities?
 2. How do they benefit students?
 3. How do they benefit the program?
 4. How do they benefit the community?
- F. Advisory Committees. Describe and assess the program's use of advisory committees.
1. Does the program currently have an advisory committee? If so, how is it used?
 2. If the program does not have an advisory committee, what efforts are being made to establish one?
 3. What role does the advisory committee play in the program?
 4. How does the program benefit from the feedback and participation of the advisory committee?
 5. Are there plans to increase the role of the advisory committee?
 6. Are there any alumni on the advisory committee?
- E. Fundraising/Development. Describe and assess the program's development activities.
1. What contacts have the program developed and maintained to aid in obtaining gifts from private concerns, governmental agencies, alumni, and the community or general public?
 2. What success has the program had in obtaining such gifts?
 3. Does the program utilize the services of the College's development officer?
 4. If not, what is the program doing to enhance this relationship?

- F. Alumni. Describe and assess the program's efforts to contact alumni and involve them in program activities.
1. Has the program surveyed graduates?
 2. What are the results of the survey?
 3. Where do they live?
 4. Have they gone on for additional education?
 5. Have the graduates surveyed been employed in occupations related to the program?
 6. Are any involved in the advisory committee for the program?
 7. Are alumni generally satisfied with the program? with the University?
 8. What improvements have alumni recommended?
 9. How did the program respond to these recommendations?

VII. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

- A. Identify, discuss, and provide benchmarking information for 3-4 programs from outside institutions. These programs should be comparable in such aspects as educational mission, university setting, and educational objectives. The program could also include a program that it aspires to be like.
1. How are these programs similar and different from your program?
 2. How do they achieve their educational mission?
 3. How effective are their techniques?
 4. What is successful and what is not?
 5. Do you consider these programs to be your competition? Why or why not?
 6. Are they members of the same professional associations and/or accrediting bodies?
- B. Identified programs are not required to come from the University's peer institution list.

VIII. ISSUES

- A. Concerns. Include results of voluntary reviews, feedback from advisory committees, or prior program reviews. This section would include information, data, feedback, and responses to activities the department willingly participates in.
1. What issues were raised and/or recommendations made by the department, the dean, and/or the Provost as a result of the last program review?
 2. How has the program responded to the issues raised?
 3. How has it implemented or how does it plan to implement the recommendations?
 4. Has the program undergone any other sort of internal review? If so, what were the results?
 5. If the program does not have an outside accrediting agency, has it been reviewed by experts within the discipline from other institutions according to accepted disciplinary standards? If so, by whom was the review conducted and what were the results?
 6. If an outside evaluator (not an employee of EMU) was employed, by whom was the review conducted? What are the reviewer's credentials?
 7. Did the evaluator make recommendations to the program? If so, does the program plan to implement them? How?
 8. Has the advisory committee provided recommendations? If so, how has the program

responded?

9. What impact will the response have on the program?

B. Mandates. This would include those activities that the program is obligated to participate in, including reviews by external accrediting bodies that the program has undergone. Include reviews done by special accrediting agencies (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.).

1. What strengths were identified by the last external review?

2. What issues or concerns were identified?

3. How has the program responded to each issue/concern?

4. How has the program implemented, or how does it plan to implement each recommendation?

5. What impact will the response have on the program?

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

A. Recommended directions. Describe and discuss recommendations for the program.

1. What steps should be taken to strengthen the program?

2. How can program quality, productivity, satisfaction, efficiency and resource values be improved?

3. Should the program be expanded, maintained at the current level, downsized, eliminated, restructured, or merged with another program? (NOTE: 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.)

B. Next Steps. Identify the 3-5 priorities for the program to achieve before the next cycle of Program Review.

X. APPENDICES

A. 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.

B. Appendices might include: a current program course listing (the whole program); advising sheets; fact sheets; current catalog copy; promotional materials; a screen capture of the web site; a list of faculty and lecturers and their vitae (5 yrs.; they can be included with the Departmental Overview if more appropriate)

Appendix B **Departmental Overview**

Department Name

College

Year of Report

The basic building blocks of the program review process are the individual academic program review reports. However for administrative coherency, the reports are grouped by academic department. The Departmental Overview is the introductory document for the departmental grouping of program review reports. It provides the department head the opportunity to provide observations and insights from the departmental perspective and considers issues that affect groups of programs or the department as a whole.

The Departmental Overview consists of six primary sections:

- Goals and Objectives.
- Programming Philosophy.
- Program Review Process.
- Strengths and Weaknesses.
- Cost Effectiveness.
- Issues and Concerns.

I. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. This section addresses the departmental goals and objectives. The departmental goals and objective should be related to the individual program goals, but take a higher, more independent perspective. For instance, a departmental goal may address new programmatic directions that are outside the role of any one program to pursue. The areas this section should address include:

- What are the department goals and objectives?
- What are the programmatic goals?
- Do they match those of the department? How?
- What are the department's goals for faculty?
- What are the department's diversity goals?
- What is the department's goal for the ratio of faculty to lecturers?
- What are the department's enrollment goals?
- What is done to ensure these goals and objectives are met?

II. PROGRAMMING PHILOSOPHY. The programming philosophy should be concise explanation that defines the programmatic coherence of the department. It should also address and define the programmatic interfaces with related departments. The programming philosophy should address:

- What is the thread that binds the programs in the department together as a whole?
- How do the various programs fit together within the department?
- What are the key programmatic interfaces with other departments on campus? How are they defined?
- How does the programming philosophy relate to the University Mission and Strategic Plan?

III. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS. To assist in future program review efforts, the department head should explain how the program review process was conducted. The process summary should address:

- How was the report developed?
- Who wrote the report?
- How was workload addressed within the department?
- How was the program review funding used?
- How long did the process take?
- What suggestions do you have to improve the process for your department?

IV. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES. This section will summarize each program's strengths and weaknesses. The department head does not make specific program rating recommendations, but does set the stage for those ratings by highlighting the key elements of each program review report. The section should mention:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of each program?
- How do they affect the department or other programs?
- What improvements can be made to the programs to reinforce strengths or address weaknesses?

V. COST EFFECTIVENESS. The department heads should assess their ability to address the various strengths and weaknesses with the available resources. In particular:

- What is the instructional cost per credit hour and cost per section credit hour? This is available in Department Profile reports.
- What trends in instructional costs can be identified?
- What is the current department budget?
- How well is the department funded to achieve its educational goals?
- What are current cost or funding concerns?

VI. ISSUES AND CONCERNS. As the department looks to the future, what are the key issues and concerns that face the department and how might they be addressed. Specifically discuss:

- What are specific needs of the department or its programs?
- What are the ongoing issues and concerns of the department?
- How can these areas best be handled?

Appendix C

Dean's Summary, Ratings, and Recommendations

College

Year of Report Program Review reports

The dean may use this template as a guide when developing and writing their recommendations for the programs from their college. The dean will use the rating scale included in the manual:

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

These recommendations may or may not match the recommendations made by the Associate Provost or the final ratings assigned by the Provost. However, the recommendations of the dean should be taken seriously, as they are a significant element considered in the final outcome of the Program Review process.

I. CONFIRM THAT THE REPORTS ARE COMPLETE.

- A. Program reports should include all ten sections listed in Appendix A of the Program Review Department Manual..
- B. Departmental Overview should include all six section listed in Appendix B of the Program Review Department Manual.

II. CONFIRM THE VALIDITY OF THE REPORTS.

- A. Evaluate all materials to determine recommended Program Ratings.
- B. Ratings will reflect:
 1. Viability.
 2. Value.
 3. Quality.
 4. Effectiveness.
 5. Efficient use of resources.
 6. Ratings:
- C. The listed ratings will require the follow up listed below. Details on follow up activities can be found on pages 13-15 of the Program Review Department Manual.
 1. (1) Continuation – The program will be reviewed in a 4 yr. cycle with no follow up required.
 2. (2) Continuation with specific changes
 - a. Program will remain on the 4 yr. cycle.
 - b. The department head will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Improvement Plan within three months of the receipt of the rating.
 3. (3) Probation.
 - a. Department Head and faculty will be given 30 days to respond to recommendation.
 - b. The department head will supervise the writing and implementation of a Post-Review Improvement Plan within 3 months.
 - c. The report will include a detailed timeline, not to exceed 3 years, to eliminate the deficiencies noted.

- d. The program will have direct access to the staff in Academic Programming to assist with implementation of the approved Post-Review Improvement Plan.
 - e. The program will undergo Program Review **annually** until the noted deficiencies are rectified.
4. (4) Phase out.
- a. Department Head and faculty will be given 30 days to respond to recommendation.
 - b. A timeline and supporting Phase Out plan will be developed, within 90 days of the final decision, to stop admissions to the program and end date the program appropriately and as expeditiously as possible.
 - c. The program will have direct access to the staff in Academic Programming to assist with implementation of the approved Phase Out plan.

**III. NARRATIVE JUSTIFYING RECOMMENDED RATING, INCLUDING
RECOMMENDED FOLLOW UP ACTIONS.**

Appendix D **Post-Review Program Improvement Plan**

Program Name
College or Graduate School
Year of Report

This template was developed to provide guidance for programs that have been rated either (2) Continuation with specific changes, or (3) Probation. The programs have 90 days to develop a Post-Review Program Improvement Plan. The plan should respond directly to the ratings and recommendations assigned by the Provost. In either case, the plan must be approved by both the program's department head and dean before implementation. In the case of (2) Continuation with specific changes, the department head and dean are responsible for active monitoring of implementation progress. In the case of (3) Probation, the Academic Programming staff will be available to assist with implementation. The Associate Provost will actively monitor progress of post-review improvement plans for those programs assigned (3) Probation. Additionally, programs assigned (3) Probation will undergo Program Review annually until noted deficiencies are rectified.

I. 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. Discuss any differences in the recommendations made by the dean, the Associate Provost, or the Provost.

II. ADOPTED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROGRAM REVIEW

- A. Which recommendations from the program review are to be adopted?
- B. If different, which recommendations from the dean, the Associate Provost, and the Provost, will be adopted?
- C. State the rationale for not adopting any recommendation.
- D. 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.

III. STEPS TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Provide a timeline of changes that will occur in the program (for programs rated (3) Probation, the timeline must not exceed 3 years).
- 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.

- E. What long-term outcomes are expected in 10 years?

IV. RESOURCE REALLOCATION

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

V. 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.
- B. State the outcomes that define a successful or unsuccessful outcome, in addition to the expected outcome.
- C. Describe how the outcome of the adopted program changes will be evaluated.
- D. Describe how incorporation of the improvement will strengthen the program.
- E. Explain how program quality, productivity, satisfaction, and resource value will be improved.
- F. 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.