I. Introduction

Continuous program review is required by The Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the university's accrediting body. (http://ncahlc.org/). The College is responsible for the development and implementation of program review to gain re-accreditation in 2017-2018. The Dean has developed a program review plan that aligns with the HLC accreditation criteria and the College strategic plan. Additionally, the Dean has established program review goals for the purposes of program quality improvement, innovation and recognition.

The Dean’s program review goals are:

- Identification of opportunities for growth and development for faculty and programs
- Promotion of positive recognition and public visibility of faculty and programs
- Continuous program improvement, innovation, and sustainability
- Alignment with the College strategic plan
- Successful re-accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission

Roles and responsibilities are as follows:

- **Dean.** Leadership and responsibility for program review planning and implementation; coordination of College program review with university goals
- **College Assessment Committee.** Develop and implement program assessment of student learning outcomes in collaboration with faculty
- **College Advisory Council.** Provide faculty input on all phases of program review and assessment of student learning
- **Department Heads.** Collaborate with program faculty to create and compile program-specific information; facilitate program faculty response to Dean's evaluation and department open meeting with the Dean
- **Faculty.** Assessment of student learning outcomes, assessment plans and reports; analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing faculty, students and programs

Support for department program review activities consists in:

- **Dean.** Coordinate alignment of program review activities with university accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission; assist department heads with standardized data collection in collaboration with IRIM; provide support on an as-needed basis.
- **Institutional Research and Information Management (IRIM).** Collect and distribute institutional data that are applicable to all programs; maintain a centralized electronic portal that will capture college reports (e.g., program reviews, assessment plans, university-wide accreditation items); identify and pilot software that is useful for EMU's institutional accreditation.

II. Program Review Cycle

The university concluded its accreditation cycle in 2012. Program review was accomplished by grouping departments/programs into successive review cycles. The College will initially review departments/programs that were first evaluated under AQIP, and continue from first to last as indicated by the previous cycle.

The departments and their initial review years are as follows:

- **2013-2014** Biology, Chemistry *(last reviewed in 2007-2008)*
- **2014-2015** Art *(last reviewed in 2007-2008, may seek NASAD accreditation)*, Computer Science, Economics, World Languages, Mathematics, Sociology/Anthropology/Criminology *(last reviewed in 2009-2010)*
- **2015-2016** Communication, Media & Theatre Arts, English Language and Literature, Geography & Geology, Women’s and Gender Studies, Political Science *(last reviewed in 2009-2010)*
- **2016-2017** African American Studies, History & Philosophy, Music & Dance, Physics & Astronomy, Psychology, Interdisciplinary Environmental Science and Society, and other new degree programs
- **2017-2018** IRIM contributes Assurance Argument, followed by HLC site visit, Assurance Review and Comprehensive Evaluation.
  **HLC Action:** Reaffirmation of Institutional Accreditation.
III. Program Review Schedule

A department's program review process encompasses one academic year and the subsequent fall term. The first year focuses on the development of the program review narrative and supporting documentation. External reviewer feedback is also accomplished in the first year, should the faculty choose this option. The fall term of the second year focuses on the Dean's recommendations and conversation between the faculty and the Dean regarding these recommendations, and the Dean's report of these program review outcomes to the College Advisory Council.

Year 1

Summer Term Department head analyzes relevant data and compile supporting documentation in collaboration with the Dean and IRIM.

September 1 Department head submits data analysis and compiled documentation to faculty for preparation of program review narrative.

November 20 (Optional) Faculty identify external reviewer who will give feedback to program review narrative/supporting documents.
Department head submits external reviewer recommendation/costs to the Dean for approval.

January 31 (Optional) External reviewer provides written feedback to program.
Faculty develop written response to external review.

April 1 Department head submits final program review narratives, external reviewer feedback, program faculty response, and supporting documents to the Dean.

Year 2

September 1 The Dean sends written evaluation of program review and provisional recommendations for quality improvement, innovation, and program sustainability to department head & faculty.

Fall Open Meeting Open meeting between the Dean, department head and faculty to discuss program review and the Dean's recommendations.

Post-Open Meeting Faculty input on the Dean's recommendations submitted to the Dean, in collaboration with the department head.

Fall CAC Meeting The Dean reports CAS program review outcomes.
IV. Program Review Questions

These Program Review questions are intended to guide department heads and program faculty in developing the program review narrative.

All supporting documentation should be referenced by the narrative and appended to it. The suggested data sources will be provided by the College and/or by IRIM. If the desired sources are specific to individual programs, then the department head shall collaborate with faculty to collect the relevant data. In all cases, data collection should be done in collaboration with the Dean.

1. **Criterion One: Mission**  
   (1 page single-spaced response + appended data)

   A. Questions:
      1. Does your department mission reflect your program's current activities and goals?
      2. How is your department's mission and objectives aligned with the CAS mission and strategic plan objectives?

2. **Criterion Two: Integrity: ethical and responsible conduct**  
   (2 page single-spaced response + appended data)

   A. **SWOT Analysis.** Provide an analysis of your program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats relative to this criterion. The following are suggested items for consideration as you develop this analysis:
      1. Describe the *processes and procedures* in place that pursue fairness and transparency in the department's allocation of resources to programs.
      2. Describe the *processes and procedures* in place that pursue integrity of scholarship and teaching within your program. For example, discuss the ways in which students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information and the steps taken to ensure academic honesty.
      3. Discuss the role that diversity and the public good play in your deliberations, highlighting one or two examples in research, curricular development, academic honesty and community engagement.
3. **Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support**  
   (4 page single-spaced response + appended data)

A. **SWOT Analysis.** Provide an analysis of your program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats relative to this criterion. The following are suggested items for consideration as you develop this analysis:

1. What are the minimum credentials of faculty, full-time lecturers, part-time lecturers, professional/technical staff in your department, relative to the degree programs offered?
2. Evaluate whether there are adequate instructional, graduate assistants, and staff support to maintain an effective learning environment and opportunities for instructors' and student success.
3. Describe the role and contribution of the general education program in your degree program.
4. Describe how your program guides students in effective use of resources and provides academic advising, community engagement opportunities and overall educational opportunities.
5. How are undergraduate and graduate research and student scholarly and creative activities supported by your department?
6. How is interdisciplinary collaboration supported by your department?
7. Describe curricular changes that have received university approval since your last program review.

4. **Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement**  
   (3 page single-spaced response + appended data)

A. **SWOT Analysis.** Provide an analysis of your program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats relative to this criterion. The following are suggested items for consideration as you develop this analysis:

1. Consider your program assessment of student learning plans, reports and feedback from the College assessment committee.
2. What are your department- or program-specific student success indicators, for example, research and creative accomplishments, community engagement, co-curricular learning, achievement in standardized tests?
3. What trends are evidenced by your program's grading practices, student retention rates and time to degree completion?
4. Consider whether and what roadblocks exist in the time to degree completion.
5. Consider whether your specialized accreditation criteria are appropriate to your program's educational goals.

5. **Criterion V. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness**
(3 page single-spaced response + appended data)

A. **SWOT Analysis.** Provide an analysis of your program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats relative to this criterion. The following are suggested items for consideration as you develop this analysis:

1. Evaluate the program trends most relevant to program and department planning, for example, full-time faculty and full-time lecturer position requests, enrollment, investments in faculty development, student academic needs and demands.
2. Do you have the fiscal and human resources, and the physical and technological infrastructure to support programmatic delivery?
3. Has your department met the College's instructional budget targets, and stayed within the operating budget allocated by the Dean to your department?
4. Consider whether your department's instructional budget targets, operating budget allocation, and other allocations are adequate for maintaining and strengthening your program. Examples of other allocations include graduate assistantships, secretarial support, professional/technical support and equipment necessary for programmatic delivery.
5. Describe the results of any sustainability initiatives in which your program has participated during this review period.
6. Describe the ways that your department acquires external resources, for example, grants, fundraising and donor gifts.

6. **External Reviewer Feedback (Optional)**
(3 page single-spaced response)

Programs are encouraged but not required to invite an external reviewer's feedback to the program review narrative and supporting documents. The program's template for the external review should be developed by program faculty in collaboration with the Department Head and Dean. Projected cost of the external review should be submitted to the Dean for approval in advance of the program's invitation to the reviewer.
V.  Suggested Data Sources  
Standard data sources will be supplied by the Dean in collaboration with IRIM. Some sources that are program-specific may need to be provided by the program's home department. This list is under development, pending final review and approval by the Dean.

1.  Criterion One: Mission  
   A. College Mission and Strategic Plan Objectives during department's program review period  
   B. Department reports showing intentional alignment with CAS mission and CAS academic goals

2.  Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct  
   A. Department Input Documents  
   B. Department Evaluation Documents  
   C. CAC Input document & CCRSL Bylaws (Dean's summary)  
   D. Evidence of relevant department procedures that pursue fairness and transparency, including but not limited to: faculty release time, spring-summer teaching assignments, equipment allocation, graduate assistant assignments, allocation of travel funding, etc.  
   E. Relevant department and/or program goals and initiatives, including but not limited to: curricular development efforts, extra-curricular teaching/learning efforts, relevant student learning outcomes, inclusion of student academic honesty policies in course syllabi, evidence of compliance with human subject review board guidelines, evidence of faculty adherence to professional codes of ethics, etc.  
   F. List of public mechanisms that build relationships between your department and external communities, e.g., advisory boards, websites, social media

3.  Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support  
   A. Up-to-date abbreviated faculty and full-time lecturer chart, showing achievements listed over the review period: scholarly/creative activity, service to the profession, grant/contract acquisition, community engagement and external leadership in the profession  
   B. Summary of academic credentials and portfolio highlights of part-time lecturers  
   C. List of support staff (non-teaching) and their role in the program(s)  
   D. List and Banner codes of major degree programs  
   E. List of program courses that serve as general education courses
F. Student learning outcomes of program courses that serve as general education courses
G. List of faculty or staff advisors per program and most recent advising materials used
H. Samples of programmatic support for effective learning environment, e.g., teaching collaboration and/or referrals to Halle staff, faculty-student collaborative opportunities in research or creative activity, number of certified faculty advisors.
I. Number and function of graduate assistantships
J. Faculty release per semester and purposes of release (e.g., capture interdisciplinary initiatives, as well as research, grants, etc.)
K. List of curricular changes approved by university

4. Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

A. List of student research, community engagement, and creative accomplishments over review period
B. List of student participation in Undergraduate Research Symposium, Graduate Fair, and/or similar venues internal and external to the university
C. List of graduating student admissions to graduate or professional programs
D. Evidence of level of student satisfaction with the major
E. Cumulative results of department/program assessment of student learning outcomes, during review period
F. Other student success indicators tracked by the program, including but not limited to internships, service learning, student teaching, the practicum, cooperative education, standardized tests.
G. Annual assessment plan, report, and College assessment committee feedback

5. Criterion V. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

A. Instructional budget targets over review period
B. Program trends over review period, for example, enrollment, head counts, and degree completion rates
C. Resource allocation practices, including but not limited to: equipment, classrooms, labs, etc.
D. Human resource allocation practices, including but not limited to: graduate assistantships, professional/technical staff, full and part-time lecturers, secretarial staff
E. List of faculty and full-time lecturer position requests and approvals or denials over the period since your last program review