

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM: 6.J

DATE: March 30, 2010

SUBJECT: Review of Institutional Program Review Guidelines ~ Update

Last year AAC had a couple of discussions about reviewing and revising the guidelines used for institutional program reviews (see [AAC Agenda Item 6.K, February 2009](#) and agenda items referenced therein). At that time, AAC agreed to form a working group to review the guidelines and forms that are pertinent to review of all programs and to suggest revisions, if it is agreed that this is warranted.

Last October, a working group comprised of Kristi Pearce, Mary Kay Helling and Lynn Rognstad did meet and they have forwarded a draft that captures their work to date (attached). They have asked that this be added to the February AAC meeting agenda for a preliminary review. The working group knows that additional work is needed but has asked to discuss their efforts to date with the Council to make sure they are moving in an agreed upon direction prior to developing a final set of guidelines and accompanying forms.

Members of the Council should be prepared to commend the work of the group and to suggest additions and changes for the draft guidelines.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Commend the work of the group; offer suggestions/recommendations for consideration.

Institutional Program Review Guidelines
WORKING DRAFT
March 2010

Purpose: The primary purpose for conducting institutional program reviews is to improve the quality of education. Periodic program review involves stakeholders in the continuous improvement of academic programs. Such review includes an analysis of past performance used to inform present and future directions and decision-making. The review process must be integrated with strategic planning and budgeting processes, with regional and specialized accreditation processes, and with student-learning outcome assessment.

Major assumptions:

1. Program review involves the comprehensive and intensive examination of a particular academic program. The review is a continuous improvement process which uses both qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the academic program.
2. The primary unit of analysis is the academic program. An academic department may have several academic programs/degrees which can be reviewed at the same time.
3. Quality is not easily defined. The definition emerges from honest professional discourse about the academic standards, learning outcomes, and societal needs.
4. Meaningful faculty involvement is critical to an effective program review.

Scope of program reviews:

All University academic programs not subject to specialized accreditation shall be evaluated at least once every seven years. The University President or Chief Academic Officer may require a shorter review interval. Universities may use national accreditation reviews to satisfy the requirement for periodic academic program review. In such cases, the timing of the review will be determined by the cycle of specialized accreditation.

Programs that are nationally accredited are required to submit a program review report using the template in [Appendix A](#). The program review report is due one month after receipt of the final letter and report from the accreditation organization.

Unit/Program Review Process

Programs not reviewed by national accreditation agencies will conduct their review in accordance with the guidelines as outlined below:

- I. Introduction: Describe the unit/program under review. The description should include the undergraduate/graduate degree programs, specializations, minors, and certificates offered; the research, scholarship and creative activity conducted (including amount of

funded research expenditures per annum since the last review); the outreach, engagement and service activities provided both within the university and externally. Include a statement on the degree programs that are offered via technology or at attendance centers.

II. Mission Centrality: Does the program advance institutional strategy? Provide data, evidence and explanation to address the following:

II.1 The program supports the mission, vision and strategic goals of the University. The institutional mission is the basis for strategic planning and setting priorities.

Demonstrate how the program links directly to and produces outcomes that advance the institutional purpose, vision and goals.

II.2 The program's mission, strategic goals and student learning outcomes are clearly stated. Faculty and students are aware of the mission, goals and outcomes.

II.3 The program contributes to other programs (undergraduate, graduate, and student support) across campus. Many programs have significant roles to play in support of other programs across campus. If this is the case, provide a brief description of how extensive this is – in general education, in interdisciplinary programs (please name them), or as support for other majors on campus (describe how), etc. Carefully consider the extent to which faculty invest time. State if the program has little or a limited role.

II.4 The program's graduates meet identifiable state, regional, national and international needs. Include placement data for graduates. Indicate if graduates are working in discipline-related fields. Provide data for the most recent 3 to 5 years.

II.5 The program's outreach, community service, and other external linkages support the cultural, educational, and economic development of the state and region. Consider the following:

- How does the program serve the state and region in ways beyond producing graduates?
- What are **the** PreK-12 linkages?
- Are there formal **and/or** informal linkages with external communities, groups, or organizations? Why does the program have these linkages?
- Are these linkages worth continuing?
- Provide quantitative and/or qualitative data regarding the program's impact on external constituencies.

III. Quality: Is the program of high quality? Provide data, evidence, and explanation to address the following:

III.1 The program is committed to creating an environment that engages students in their learning. This type of learning environment challenges students to be open, to critically explore diverse perspectives, and to welcome the opportunity to question personal viewpoints, both in and out of the classroom.

- Describe elements of the program, classroom-based activities, and co-curricular activities that are intentionally designed to develop the ability to understand different points of view. Provide copies of syllabi.
- Describe practical learning experiences, (internships, service learning) that contribute to student engagement.
- Explain how technology or other tools are used to engage students in their learning.
- Identify trends in library publications and journals that demonstrate how the collection has changed over the past 3-5 years.
- Are library resources invested in publications and services that are actively used by students and faculty? Evaluate the investments for the college/unit.

III.2 The curriculum is contemporary and coherent, appropriately representing the breadth and depth of the discipline. In this section, describe curricular changes that have been made since the last program review. Describe the data sources and process used for reviewing and updating curriculum. Information received from advisory boards, alumni, exit interviews should be included (if available).

-

III.3 The program assessment process is well developed, adequately documented with measurable student learning outcomes, and consistently used to improve the program and student learning. The assessment process is one that is consistent, continuous, formalized, and carefully documented. It employs multiple measures to inform evaluation of learning outcomes, and then uses the results to take actions for improvement. Explain how assessment data are shared with faculty, how curriculum changes are made and what differences any changes made in student learning?

III.4 The program demonstrates and promotes equity, diversity, and inclusiveness. The program values multiple perspectives, which include race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, ethnicity, age, and disability. Address this from the following perspectives: recruitment and retention of students, staff and faculty, and curriculum. Consider the following:

- How does the unit/program promote inclusiveness?
- What supports are in place for a diverse student body? What alternative pedagogies are used for multiple learning styles?
- How does the curriculum reflect sensitivity to diverse cultures? (awareness, knowledge of, understanding [is sensitivity the only component?](#))

III.5 The program demonstrates that faculty and instructional staff remain up-to-date in their disciplines and use current knowledge and strategies to engage students in active

learning. The program recognizes the scholarship of teaching and learning to ensure that learning activities are grounded in evidence-based instructional practices.

- Describe steps the program has used to keep faculty up-to-date.
- How have the Professional Development Plans (PDPs) been used to assist in the development of needed knowledge and skills?
- To what degree do faculty use inter-library loan or other library services for professional development and research, scholarship, and creative activity?

III.6 The program demonstrates that its faculty members are productive scholars, researchers, or creative artists in ways that support the institution's mission throughout their years of employment. Provide 3-5 years' worth of evidence of scholarly engagement, including peer-reviewed publications, performances, exhibitions, and funded research expenditures per annum.

- Describe how faculty members recognize the importance of engaging students in collaborative scholarly activities and creative projects as a critical component of learning. (Information from the PDP might be helpful here.)
- Explain any new initiatives for undergraduate research, if applicable.

III.7 The unit uses academic advisors who support student learning. Describe how the program's academic advising responsibilities are assigned and assessed. Evaluate the effectiveness of advising for undergraduate and graduate students.

III.8 The program contributes in a unique or unusual way (through its teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service) that enhances the university's identity and distinctiveness.

III.9 The program has sufficient staffing to provide effective continuity and stability and is not vulnerable to personnel changes that could interfere with sustaining quality assurance. Consider the number and longevity of faculty and staff. How is the unit/program positioning itself to hire personnel with the expertise in strategic areas? Provide a list of faculty and staff by name, year of hire, rank, areas of expertise. (See below)

III.10 The program has sufficient facilities (i.e., classrooms, laboratories, etc.) and equipment to provide effective teaching, learning, and research environments.

- **Are the information resources and services of the University Libraries adequate to support effective teaching, learning and research environments?**

IV: Cost: Is the program financially viable? Specifically comment on program cost effectiveness relative to the following: (Please attach the "Instruction Cost and Productivity" documents provided by Finance and Budget in alternating years (beginning in fall 2010; prepared in FY11 with FY10 data. These Instruction Cost and Productivity documents include academic year, Fall-Spring credit hours and costs for direct instruction. They do NOT include summer school credit

hours or instructional costs.) Review and analyze for trends. Compare to the data from peer institutions.) (If you only have one year's data, please use those.)

- IV.1 The number of student credit hours generated per full-time equivalent (FTE) instructional staff. Provide 3-7 years worth of data.
- IV.2 The number of student credit hours generated at the graduate and undergraduate levels.
- IV.3 The number of student credit hours generated at the upper-division (300-400 level), lower-division (100-200 level) and graduate course levels.
- IV.4 The number of student credit hours generated by each of the following: tenured/tenure-track faculty, (other regular faculty (full-time term, i.e., instructors), supplemental faculty (part-time and adjuncts), and graduate assistants.
- IV.5 Direct instructional expenditures per student credit hour. This includes all expenditures needed to produce student credits, including those for personnel (both instructional and support), services, travel, equipment and supplies, etc. (See Table 4: Instruction Productivity and Cost Ratios, item 6)

Note: Comparative data are provided from the Delaware Study. These were distributed by Finance and Budget.

V. Program Productivity: How productive is the program? Comment on the program's productivity in regard to the following:

- V.1 Number of graduates in each degree program per year (based on CIP Code). For any undergraduate majors or specializations graduating fewer than 20 masters programs graduating fewer than 12, or doctoral programs graduating fewer than 6 students over the past four years, discuss their importance to the University in terms of mission centrality, quality and incremental cost.

VI: Plans for the Future: Given the present status of the program, what changes are proposed to help the program advance? Include targets for change and plans to enhance quality and competitiveness. Based on this evaluation, what updates need to be made in the strategic plan?

VII. Assessment of progress: How will we evaluate future progress and successes? Identify 5-10 key benchmarks which will be used to evaluate progress.

PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT TO BOARD OF REGENTS

Due 30 days following receipt of the Reviewers' Report

This form is available on InsideState from Academic Evaluation and Assessment

This report will be filed with the Board of Regents. All departments or schools undergoing an accreditation review or an institutional program review are to complete this form. The Dean or Department Head must approve this report and submit it to the Director of Academic Evaluation and Assessment for approval and submission to the Board of Regents.

South Dakota State University

Department or School: _____

Program(s) Reviewed: _____

Date of Review: _____

Please identify the program reviewers and any external accrediting body:

Items A & B should address the following issues: [curricular offerings/program structure](#), [enrollment demand](#), [graduates/placement](#), [financing](#), and [other indicators of program quality and viability](#).

- A. Describe the strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers.
- B. Briefly summarize the review recommendations.
- C. Indicate the present and continuing actions to be taken by the school/college or department to address the issues raised by the review. What outcomes are anticipated as a result of these actions?

Submitted by: _____
Department Head

Reviewed by: _____
Dean

Approved by: _____
Director, Academic Evaluation and Assessment

Draft Draft Draft

Attachment A

**Table XX
Faculty and Staff**

Department: _____

Program: _____

Year: _____

Name	Year of Hire	Rank	Highest Degree	Grad Faculty	Field of Study	Institution	Area/s of Expertise

Assistance with table is available in Finance & Budget

Draft Draft Draft

Attachment B

**Table XX
Graduates per Program Year**

Department: _____

Program: _____

CIP Code _____

Degree: _____

# of Graduates	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	Total
Total							
Breakdown by Gender							
Male							
Female							
Breakdown by Ethnicity							
African American							
American Indian/ Alaskan Native							
Asian American/ Pacific Islander							
Caucasian							
Mexican American							
Other Hispanic or Latino							
Puerto Rican							
Multiracial							
Other							

V.2 Enrollment in program (by CIP code). Include enrollment figures from most recent census figures for fall semester. Include breakdown by gender and ethnicity.

Draft Draft Draft

Attachment C

**Table XX
Program Enrollment**

Department: _____

Program: _____ **CIP Code:** _____

Degree: _____

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	Total
Undergraduate						
Graduate						
Minors						