

Program and Department Review

Each academic degree program offered at the University, including the general education core curriculum, must be reviewed periodically, consistent with Board of Trustees policy 620.1, Arkansas code 6-61-214, and policy of the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board. See Academic Policy 1620.11 for the current schedule of program reviews. Institutional reviews are scheduled for each program as part of the review of the academic department (including all of the undergraduate and graduate programs, centers, offices and institutes housed in the department) or of the program alone if it is housed in the school or college. Each program is scheduled for review at least every seven years and/or consistent with accreditation review. Scheduled dates for unit review may be changed as needed by requests from dean(s) to the provost submitted on or before February 15 each year. Proposal of a major program change (for example, addition of a concentration or a significant reorganization) may trigger a unit review unless one has been conducted within the immediately preceding three years. Unit review outcome and evaluative data will be a factor in planning and resource allocation decisions.

Accredited programs will present the findings of their accrediting body, along with materials prepared for the visiting accreditation team, as a substitute for the institution program review process. If significant aspects of the institution review process are omitted from the accrediting body review and self-study, a review of these aspects will be scheduled on the basis of a supplement to the accreditation self-study report (to address a campus-only audience). All units will participate in the Responses to Review portion of the process. See Academic Policy 1620.11 for a list of accrediting bodies and dates for accreditation periods or campus visits. Normally, a department and all its units will undergo review the year an accreditation review is scheduled for one or more of the program(s) in the department, although a separate review of non-accredited programs may be preferable. If a department has more than one accrediting body, the department and dean will choose the year for review.

Review Process

Program/department review should begin no later than August 1 for each program to be reviewed during the academic year. At the outset of the self-study process, programs/departments will be asked by the Director of Program Review and Assessment (Director) for the institution to identify five people not employed by the University of Arkansas (Fayetteville) who are well qualified to serve as outside reviewers and to submit data regarding their qualifications to the Director. Two reviewers will be selected per program/department.

Documentation

Much of the documentation used in program review must be supplied by the academic department. In addition, the Office of Institutional Research will prepare a program evaluation summary report for each academic department for the year during which any program in the department is to be reviewed. Basic student data (demographic, graduation, and enrollment) and faculty data (demographic, classroom productivity, and comparative salary information) will be provided in this report. The University Libraries will generate data on library support for degree and research programs housed in the department. [See Note at the end of this policy statement.] The dean's office responsible for funding the program under review will provide expenditure data from department accounts distributed by expenditure category. The department will provide the other information identified in the Guidelines. Copies of the most recent three annual reports of the department should be appended to the self-study report.

Self-Study and Report

In consultation with the Director and the dean of the school or college, the program/department will conduct self-evaluation and prepare a self-study report draft. The self-evaluation process should begin with analysis of institutional data provided to the department and identification of additional data that will need to be provided by the department. The report draft will be consistent with the Guidelines appended

to this policy and will include all required components. The dean of the school or college in which the department is housed will participate in the department review, as will deans of the graduate school and the honors college, to the extent required to assure reasonable concurrence regarding conclusions. The Director will review the draft for inclusion of all required elements. When the self-study draft has the approval of the school or college dean and concurrence from the deans of the graduate school and honors college, a minority report may be attached, if desired by graduate or honors dean or the majority of the program faculty. A college review may be conducted, if desired by the dean. *The review will normally be completed by January 31*, and the report and any attachments and appendices will be forwarded as a final report to the Director to provide a basis for institution and external review.

Campus and External Consultant Role in Review

The Director will meet with the Program Review Committee for the institution and will assign each member of the committee to a program/department review process and to a program review subcommittee. The program review subcommittees will review the self-study reports.

The Director will schedule a two-day site visit to include the external reviewers chosen for each program/department, the program review subcommittee, members of the department, selected students, deans, and outside constituencies as appropriate. Following the site visit, each member of the program review subcommittee will submit brief evaluative statements regarding the program/department to the Director, consistent with institutional guidelines.

The Director will compile a draft review report for distribution to sub-committee members and external reviewers, will collect feed-back, and will prepare a final report. The Director will forward the final report to the program faculty, the dean, and the provost for appropriate action. The Director will also forward a copy of the final report to the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council for their information.. The site visits will normally be completed by the end of the spring term or May 15 with the final review report being completed by August 15.

Responses to Review

Following submission of the review report to the department/program, deans, and provost, a Strategies for Progress/Maintenance statement will be drafted by the department/program as a summary statement in response to the findings of the campus program review process. In consultation with the dean of the school or college, the program/department will state strategies and desired outcomes to address areas of concern and focus. When the dean of the school or college has reviewed, approved, and signed the Strategies for Progress/Maintenance statement, it will be forwarded to the Director for Program Review and Assessment (Director) on or before December 15. The Director will then forward the response to the provost who will review and acknowledge receipt of the document. Copies will be returned to the program/department, dean of the school or college and Director. During the next annual review process, action taken as a result of the strategies statement will be assessed by the program/department chair, the dean, and the Director. If further action is deemed appropriate by the chair, dean or Director, a dated notation should be appended to the original strategy statement and copies provided to all participants. Further actions may be taken, through regular campus channels, depending upon the outcome of the program review, ranging from program revision or reorganization along various dimensions to program expansion or program deletion.

The program review process will be examined each year to identify needed changes.

Note: University Libraries Report Content for Program Review

Where available, program accreditation reports will be reviewed for scope and updated with the latest information. Most such reports include an assessment—provided by library subject specialists—of scope, content, and currency of monographic collections, and an assessment of journal and electronic resources which support the program, including rankings with the ISI-Thompson Journal Citation Report. Budget information (current or linear), and staffing support is also generally included. Where time permits, program faculty and students may also be asked to provide an assessment.

Where no accreditation report is available, a collection content and user assessment report will be structured to incorporate the above categories of information based on the Collection Policy Statement for the program, if one has been completed. Collection Policy Statements identify intended level of support (1-4) ranging from instruction to research support. Content reports would also include information regarding the most important resources and services supporting the program.

Data components of these reports will include collection size, any available peer institution information, and expenditures for books, journals, and electronic resources.

7/15/07

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM/ DEPARTMENT REVIEW

Required Components of Self Study and Report

The institutional goals will provide a primary basis for program review: 1) improving academic quality and reputation; 2) increasing the size and quality of the student body; 3) enhancing diversity among students, faculty, and staff; 4) increasing public support, particularly from federal and state governments; 5) increasing private support.

Within this framework and consistent with institutional goals, departments will be expected to identify specific objectives for the programs of study and research in which the department is engaged, including service and other outreach and entrepreneurial activities, as part of the basis for review.

Self-Study documents will respond to the following items as the first step in program review.

[Append the profile data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, University Libraries, and Treasurer's Office for reference as needed in the report. Also append summary data on program inputs such as student profile (average high school GPA, average ACT score, college GPA) and faculty profile (one-page summary for each full-time faculty member and professional staff member listing credentials and most recent notable achievements)]

1. Provide quantitative and qualitative evidence from direct and indirect measures of the extent to which the intended educational (learning) outcomes of each program in the department are being achieved. Include benchmarking data. Provide three years of data. Cite evidence that strong performance is recognized when identified through annual review or other processes. Cite evidence that unsatisfactory performance is addressed.

[Note: evidence will be expected to include such things as achievement on senior exams, projects, capstone courses, standardized test scores and rankings including licensure and GRE exams, honor rankings, professional placement and job offers (including acceptance for post-graduate study), competitive achievements within the discipline, alumni distinction and achievement.]

2. Provide quantitative and qualitative evidence from direct and indirect measures of the extent to which the intended research and creative outcomes of each program in the department are being achieved. Include benchmarking data. Provide three years of data. Cite evidence that strong performance is recognized when identified through annual review or other processes. Cite evidence that unsatisfactory performance is addressed.

[Note: evidence will be expected to include such things as quantity and quality of publications, performances, shows, presentations, citations, awards, grants, and contracts].

3. Provide quantitative and qualitative evidence from direct and indirect measures of the extent to which the intended outreach/service/entrepreneurial outcomes of department/program initiatives are being achieved. Include benchmarking data. Provide three years of data. Cite examples that strong performance is recognized when identified through annual review or other processes. Cite evidence that unsatisfactory performance is addressed.

[Note: evidence will be expected to include such things as assessment of program effectiveness, numbers and types of services or programs provided, numbers and types of participants and recipients of services, partnerships and other collaborative and joint ventures, income and resources expended and gained]

4. Provide evidence of breadth/focus and currency for each program, including the program's consistency with good practice as exemplified in peer institutions and as identified by professional organization(s). Cite evidence of the coherence and integration of all required courses and activities within the program design. Cite evidence that programs systematically introduce students

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM/ DEPARTMENT REVIEW (continued)

throughout the program experience to their prospective workplaces and professionals in the field. Cite evidence of how students are systematically involved in research and service by program requirements and activities.

5. Provide qualitative and quantitative evidence regarding how the department promotes and supports those interdisciplinary initiatives in which it or its faculty participate.
6. Provide evidence of quality and quantity of academic advising and mentoring of students at each level of study. Include evidence to document inputs (preparation, maintenance of student files, and structure) and outcomes (student progress, retention, and satisfaction). Cite examples that strong performance is recognized when identified through annual review or other processes. Cite evidence that unsatisfactory performance is addressed.
7. Provide evidence that understanding of and respect for cultural diversity is reflected in the curriculum of each program, in program activities, in assignments of program responsibilities and duties; in honors, awards, and scholarship recognition; in recruitment. Cite evidence that strong performance is recognized when identified through annual review or other processes. Cite evidence of means used to address lack of cultural understanding and respect for cultural differences in the curriculum, teaching, learning, department activities. Include outcomes data.
8. Cite evidence of kinds of support provided for retention of qualified students from term to term and of support for student progress toward and achievement of graduation or their alternate academic goals. Include outcomes data.
9. Analyze and cite evidence of the extent to which resources from all sources are adequate/inadequate to support progress toward program, department and institutional goals. Identify the additional/different resources (including policy, practice, and organizational structure) that would most contribute to the program/department's ability to meet institutional goals.
10. Cite evidence to support the cost-effectiveness of department operations and programs.
11. If the program(s) provides professional training, cite evidence of job prospects for graduates of each across the next five years.
12. If the program(s) are not linked to specific professions/occupations, cite evidence of the extent to which graduates are able to find jobs or further education to meet their expectations. Cite any evidence for change in job prospects during the next five years.
13. Identify challenges facing the program(s)/department that could be addressed or ameliorated without additional funding. (Optional)
14. Provide any additional information that will facilitate an understanding of the program/department operations, status, goals, and achievements. Should the department wish to identify needed changes in operations, programs, or other changes in direction, that statement should be included along with a rationale related to benchmarking and good practice. (Optional)
15. Conclusion: Explain and interpret the data provided in 1-14 in the context of the department's recent history (most recent 7-years). Cite any unusual achievements and challenges. Relate the data to that for programs and initiative counterparts at peer institutions where possible.

7/15/07