

College of Arts and Sciences
Program Review Plan 2022-2027

I. Introduction

Continuous program review is required by The Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the University's accrediting body (www.hlcommission.org). The College is responsible for the development and implementation of program review to gain re-accreditation in 2027-28. The Dean has developed a program review plan that aligns with the HLC accreditation criteria and the University 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 University Strategic Plan, and
- 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 in collaboration with faculty.
- **College Advisory Council:** Provide faculty input on all phases of program review and assessment of student learning.
- **Department Heads and School Directors:** 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 challenges 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 and School Directors 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.

Every Doctoral, Master's, and Bachelor's degree program should be reviewed. Minors and certificate programs need not be reviewed, and externally accredited programs may substitute their accreditation report for the process presented in this plan. A database of CAS programs may be found on the CAS website (www.emich.edu/cas/degrees-programs/index.php).

II. Program Review Cycle

All of the programs offered by a school or department will be reviewed in the same year. The review years of schools, departments, and College programs are as follows:

2022-23	Biology; Computer Science; Economics; World Languages
2023-24	Art & Design; Communication, Media & Theatre Arts; English Language & Literature; Mathematics & Statistics; Music & Dance; Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology
2024-25	Africology & African American Studies; Geography & Geology; History & Philosophy; Political Science; Women's & Gender Studies
2025-26	Chemistry; Physics & Astronomy; Psychology; Data Science & Analytics; Environmental Science and Society; Neuroscience
2026-27	Draft Assurance Argument in preparation for HLC site visit in 2027-28.

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.

Year 1

Summer Term	Department Head / School Director analyzes relevant data and compiles supporting documentation in collaboration with the Dean and IRIM.
September 1	Department Head / School Director 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 and supporting documents. Department Head / School Director submits external reviewer recommendation and 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 / School Director submits final program review narratives, external reviewer feedback (optional), program faculty response to external review (optional), and supporting documents to the Dean.
<u>Year 2</u>	
September 1	The Dean sends written evaluation of program review and provisional recommendations for quality improvement, innovation, and program sustainability to Department Head / School Director and faculty.
Fall Open Meeting	Open meeting between the Dean, Department Head / School Director 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 / School Director.

IV. SOAR Framework for Program Review

The College Assessment Committee (CASAC) has recommended that CAS employ a strengths-based approach to Program Review. Consequently, we are adopting the SOAR framework for Program Review in 2022-27. SOAR stands for strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and results. "SOAR focuses on the formulation and implementation of a positive strategy by identifying strengths, building creativity in the form of opportunities, encouraging individuals and teams to share aspirations, and determining measurable and meaningful results."¹

To have SOAR-based conversations about your programs, consider the following questions:

Strengths

- What do we do well?
- What are our greatest assets?

Opportunities

- What are our best opportunities for growth and improvement?
- What potential do we recognize?
- How do we best partner with others?

Aspirations

- To what do we aspire?

¹ Stavros, J. M., & Cole, M. L. (2013). "SOARing towards positive transformation and change." *The ABAC ODI JOURNAL Vision. Action. Outcome.*, 1(1): 10. The description of the SOAR framework presented here is drawn from this article.

- What are our stakeholders asking for?
- What should our future look like?

Results

- What are our measurable results?
- How will we know we are succeeding?
- What resources are required to achieve the results we want?

Steps to facilitate SOAR-based conversations for Program Review:

- Identify what data is needed for each criterion and collect it.
 - Data can come from internal sources (department) and external sources (Dean's office, IRIM).
 - One type of data can be used for more than one criterion.
 - Distribute data to all faculty members.
 - Ask faculty members to review the data and to identify strengths and opportunities.
- Set up one, two, or more SOAR meetings to discuss your academic programs' strengths and potential. Where programs share content and resources, you may discuss more than one program in a single meeting.
- You may structure your meetings by discussing each of the five HLC criteria in turn, or by discussing strengths relative to all five criteria, then opportunities, then aspirations, and finally results. Choose the approach that works best for your facilitator and group. The former approach lends itself to more structured meetings, while the latter approach may lead to more free-flowing conversations.
- Designate a notetaker for each meeting. After the meeting, share the notes with department members so that they can clarify and expand their comments, and correct and approve the record. Use these notes to write your report narrative.

V. Program Review Questions

These Program Review questions are intended to guide Department Heads / School Directors 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 / School Director shall collaborate with faculty to collect the relevant data. In all cases, data collection should be done in collaboration with the Dean.

A. Criterion One: Mission

(1 page single-spaced response + appended data)

SOAR Analysis Discuss your program's strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and desired results relative to this criterion. The following are suggested items for consideration as you develop this analysis:

1. Is your department mission articulated publicly? Does your stated mission align with your current activities and goals?²
2. How do your department's mission and objectives align with the College and University mission and strategic plan objectives?
3. Does your mission statement express a commitment to inclusive and equitable treatment of diverse populations? (If you articulate this commitment in another way, please explain.) How do you ensure that all students are included and treated equitably in your processes and activities? What steps do you take to foster a climate of respect among all students, faculty, staff, and administrators?
4. Does your mission include preparing students for informed citizenship and workplace success?

B. Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

(2 page single-spaced response + appended data)

SOAR Analysis Discuss your program's strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and desired results 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.
2. Describe the processes and procedures in place that pursue integrity of scholarship and teaching within your program. For example, how do you guide students in the ethical use of information? What steps do you take 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.

C. Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support

(4 page single-spaced response + appended data)

SOAR Analysis Discuss your program's strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and desired results 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, and professional/technical staff in your department, relative to the degree programs offered?

² These suggested questions are based on the HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. See www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html for more detail.

2. Do you have adequate instructional, graduate assistant, and staff support to maintain an effective learning environment and opportunities for instructors' and students' success?
3. Describe the role and contribution of the General Education program in your degree program.
4. Describe how your program guides students in the effective use of information 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 does your department support interdisciplinary collaboration?

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

(3 page single-spaced response + appended data)

SOAR Analysis Discuss your program's strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and desired results relative to this criterion. The following are suggested items for consideration as you develop this analysis:

1. Describe your department's processes for evaluating student learning at the program level. Do you submit plans and reports to the College Assessment Committee and consider the committee's feedback?
2. Describe curricular changes that have received University approval since your last program review.³ What processes informed your decisions to make these changes?
3. What are your department- or program- specific student success indicators, for example, research and creative accomplishments, community engagement, co-curricular learning, or achievement in standardized tests?
4. What trends are evidenced by your program's grading practices, student retention rates, and time to degree completion?
5. Consider whether and what roadblocks exist in the time to degree completion.
6. Consider whether your specialized accreditation criteria are appropriate to your program's educational goals.

E. Criterion Five: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

(3 page single-spaced response + appended data)

³ Dates of the last program review were: 2013-14: Biology, Chemistry; 2014-2015: Art, Computer Science, Economics, World Languages, Mathematics, Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology; 2015-16: Communication, Media & Theatre Arts, English Language & Literature, Geography & Geology, Women's & Gender Studies, Political Science; 2016-17: Africology & African American Studies, History & Philosophy, Music & Dance, Physics & Astronomy, Psychology, Interdisciplinary Environmental Science and Society.

SOAR Analysis Discuss your program's strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and desired results 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, and 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, such as grants and gifts.

F. 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.

VI. Suggested Data Sources

Standard data sources will be supplied by the Dean in collaboration with IRIM. Some sources that are program-specific will need to be provided by the program's home department.

A. Criterion One: Mission

1. Department Mission Statement and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement
2. College and University Mission Statements

B. Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

1. Department Input Document
2. Department Evaluation Document
3. College of Arts and Sciences Input Document
4. Evidence of relevant department procedures that pursue fairness and transparency, including but not limited to: faculty release time, summer teaching assignments, equipment allocation, graduate assistant assignments, allocation of travel funding, etc.
5. 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.
6. List of public mechanisms that build relationships between your department and external communities, e.g., advisory boards, websites, social media.

C. Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support

1. A roster of faculty members, full-time lecturers, and part-time lecturers with their academic credentials.
2. Achievements of faculty members (and optionally, lecturers) over the review period in the areas of scholarly/creative activity, service to the profession, grant/contract acquisition, community engagement, and external leadership in the profession.
3. List of support staff (non-teaching) and their role in the program(s).
4. List and Banner codes of degree programs.
5. List of program courses that serve as General Education courses.
6. Student learning outcomes of program courses that serve as General Education courses.
7. List of faculty or staff advisors per program and most recent advising materials used.
8. 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.
9. Number and function of graduate assistantships.
10. Faculty release per semester and purposes of release (e.g., capture interdisciplinary initiatives, as well as research, grants, etc.).

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

1. List of student research, community engagement, and creative accomplishments over review period.

2. List of student participation in the Undergraduate Research Symposium, Graduate Research Conference, and/or similar venues internal and external to the University.
3. List of graduating student admissions to graduate or professional programs.
4. Evidence of the level of student satisfaction with the program.
5. Student learning outcomes for each program.
6. Cumulative results of department/program assessment of student learning during the review period, including annual assessment plans, reports, and College Assessment Committee feedback.
7. List of significant curricular changes approved by the University with explanation and/or rationale for changes.⁴
8. Other student success indicators tracked by the program, such as internships, service learning, student teaching, practicums, cooperative education, standardized tests, and job placements.

E. Criterion Five: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

1. Instructional budget targets and actual FYES/FTEL over the review period.
2. Program trends over the review period, for example, enrollment, head counts, and degree completion rates.
3. Resource allocation practices, including but not limited to equipment, classrooms, labs, etc.
4. Human resource allocation practices, including but not limited to graduate assistantships, professional/technical staff, full and part-time lecturers, and secretarial staff.
5. List of faculty and full-time lecturer position requests and approvals or denials over the review period.
6. Controllable budgets and spending over review period.

⁴ The Director of Program Administration and Assurance can generate a list of approved course and program proposals for your school or department. All proposals from June 2014 to present can be accessed in Curriculog.