

## Academic Program Review at WOU Review Committee Guidelines and Guidance

### Selection of reviewers

We expect reviews will include external as well as internal reviewers.

1. Internal reviewers will be selected from among senior faculty in cognate programs at WOU.
2. The program leader and dean may nominate external reviewers. Proposed external reviewers should be from public, 4-year institutions that have missions similar to WOU. Funding for reviewer travel and modest honorarium will be available.
3. The Provost may appoint nominated reviewers or other qualified reviewers.

### The reviewer's visit

The reviewers will be asked to address the following:

1. The strengths of the department, listing any specific commendations.
2. Overall observations and determinations regarding the quality and the rigor of the academic programs.
3. The effectiveness of the department's Assessment Plan and assessment activities, including program learning outcomes (in the Assessment Plan) and course learning outcomes (in course syllabi).
4. Status of the each program curriculum in terms of breadth and currency with the discipline. That is, is each curriculum still relevant and has the curriculum kept pace with changes in the discipline?
5. Overall level of faculty productivity as it relates to the stated missions of the department and university.
6. Alignment of each of the department's academic programs with the Core Themes and strategic priorities of the institution.
7. Diversity of the department's faculty and student body.
8. Overall assessment of the quality of graduates produced by the programs in the department.
9. Any weaknesses or unrealized opportunities, with specific recommendations for action.

### The reviewer's report

We request that the final written report be organized using the following general headings, although the committee is welcome to adjust this to fit its unique needs:

1. Members of Review Committee (including name, title, institutional affiliation)
2. Process  
*Please provide a brief overview of the structure of the review with special attention paid to any components not described in this document.*
3. Scope of Review  
*Please provide a short narrative describing the specific areas that were reviewed. Also, if any areas of departmental activity were not reviewed, please list these specifically.*

4. Assessments
  - a. Academic Programs (quality, rigor, relevance)
  - b. Department Productivity (teaching, degrees, research, service)
  - c. Alignment with Core Themes and Mission
  - d. Diversity of the department's faculty and student body
  - e. Department Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Reports
  - f. Department priorities, as articulated in the self-study or interviews
  - g. Department facilities and program support activities
  
5. Strengths:  
*Areas of notable success, or where the department excels relative to its peers should be documented in the Reviewer's Report.*
  
6. Challenges:  
*The challenges should relate specifically to the department's ability to contribute meaningfully to WOU's Mission and Core Themes.*
  
7. Opportunities:  
*These are the specific recommendations that the review team makes designed to assist the department in contributing meaningfully to WOU's Mission and Core Themes.*