

To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: Sue Monahan, Associate Provost for Academic Effectiveness
Re: Request for Information Item – Academic Program Review draft documents
Date: January 17, 2017

*As Provost Scheck indicated at the January 10, 2017 Faculty Senate meeting, WOU will begin Academic Program Reviews (APR) in 2017-18. What follows is **DRAFT** Faculty Handbook language regarding Academic Program Review.*

Rationale: WOU is a teaching and learning institution. Academic program review drives continuous improvement through (1) critical evaluation of current activities (e.g., self-study), (2) identification of specific strengths and areas for improvement, and (3) program-level strategic planning that aligns programs and resource allocation with university mission. While required by NWCCU, academic program review is, first and foremost, for the benefit of WOU programs and the students we serve, ensuring that we engage in systematic inquiry into the effectiveness of our academic programs and use findings to improve.

Scope: All academic programs are subject Academic Program Review. Academic programs include majors, minors, certificates and all general education options at the graduate and undergraduate levels as well as academic support services (e.g., AALC, Math Center, Writing Center). For accredited programs, Academic Program Review will be aligned with and supplement the accreditation cycle but not supplanted by it.

Frequency of Review: Academic programs will be reviewed at least once every seven years. The schedule for Academic Program Review is posted on the Provost's website (see link).

Responsibilities

- The Provost's Office will support Academic Program Review through consultations, workshops and guidelines related to self-study, program review procedures and action plans.
- The Provost will, in consultation with the academic dean and program leader, appoint the ad hoc review committee.
- The program leader, in consultation with program faculty, will prepare the program self-study, per guidelines provided by the Provost's Office.
- Institutional Research will provide program level data, as specified in the program review guidelines, for inclusion in the self-study.
- The program leader, program faculty and academic dean will use the review results to create an action plan for program improvement and provide annual updates on progress.

External Reviewers: The review committee may include one or more reviewers external to WOU. Reviewers may be recommended by the program or dean. The Provost may appoint recommended reviewers or other qualified reviewers.

*Academic Program Review guidance will be integrated into the **Faculty Handbook** (the proposed language is the non-italicized text above). Additional guidance is attached here: (1) DRAFT Self-Study Template (that aligns with WOU's Strategic Plan and Core Themes), (2) DRAFT Schedule of Review Activities, (3) DRAFT Guidance Regarding External Reviewers.*

DRAFT

Template for self-study for Academic Program Review

Introduction

1. Mission and Goals
2. Areas of Distinction
3. Trends and changes
 1. In the discipline
 2. In student demographics and HECC priorities
 3. In regional/state workforce needs
 4. In curriculum resulting from ongoing assessment
4. Data provided by Institutional Research (see below)

Program Self-Assessment

5. Alignment with and contributions to *academic excellence*
 1. Majors, minors and certificates
 2. General education and other curricular service
 3. Curricular alignment and continuous improvement
 4. Opportunities for and prevalence of high-impact learning experiences
 5. Creative and scholarly contributions of faculty and students
6. Alignment with and contributions to *student success*
 1. Variety of curricular delivery pathways (e.g., online, hybrid, evening or weekend courses, distance delivery)
 2. 4-year, 180-credit degree pathways
 3. Partnerships with feeder institutions (e.g., community colleges, high schools)
 4. Academic advising and other co-curricular programs
 5. Student outcomes, post-graduation (e.g., careers, graduate school, civic engagement)
7. Alignment with and contributions to *community*
 1. Activities that support a diverse and accessible campus
 2. Faculty and student engagement in the broader community

Program future

8. Additional department **analysis** of institution-provided data, including analysis of sustainability and future potential of the academic programs
9. Program priorities and plans for the future

Appendices

1. Relevant material from WOU catalog: Degree requirements, admissions requirements (if applicable), course listings, course goals
2. Program **assessment** plan(s), including learning outcomes, and recent annual assessment reports.
3. Program Curriculum map(s)

4. Current CVs for faculty (suggested length: 2-3 pages each, include all publications for past 5 years)

If available:

5. Department **strategic plan**
6. Self-assessment of the department's **progress** on strategic goals

DRAFT Schedule of review activities

Who?	What?	When? ...by
Associate Provost	Notifies Dean and Program Leader of Program Review	March 1, year prior to the review
Program Leader	Indicates which term s/he prefers to receive the course release for service related to the review	May 1, year prior to the review
Associate Provost	Provides workshop/consultation on preparation of the self-study	May 31, year prior to the review
Provost	Decides whether or not review team will have one or more external members	July 1, year prior to the review
Institutional Research	Provides program data to Program Leader	September 16, review year OR May 31, year prior to review
Dean & Program Leader	Identify possible dates for review visit/activities and notify Associate Provost; develop schedule for review visit/activities	October 15, review year
Dean	Forwards reviewer nominations (from faculty, Department Head, and Dean) to Associate Provost	October 31, review year
Program Leader	Coordinates completion of the self-study (see guidelines), in consultation with program faculty	November 30, review year
Provost	Selects reviewers	November 30, review year
Dean	Arranges for reviewer travel and accommodations	January 15, review year
Associate Provost	Prepares draft charge letter for Provost	December 31, review year
Reviewers	Meet with Provost, Dean and Program Leader (Charge meeting)	<i>Review Visit, Winter/Spring of review year</i>
Reviewers	Interview identified groups according to schedule provided	<i>Review Visit, Winter/Spring of review year</i>
Reviewers	Meet with Associate Provost, Dean, and Program Leader (Exit meeting)	<i>Review Visit, Winter/Spring of review year</i>
Reviewers	Complete draft report, submit to Department Head for fact check	Within 14 days of review visit
Department Head	Responds to reviewers/factual errors	Within five days of receiving draft of report
Reviewers	Complete final report, submit to Dean	Within 30 days of review visit
Dean	Sends copies of final report to Associate Provost and Provost, along with recommendations	Within 14 days of receiving the final report
Provost, Dean and Program Leader	Meet to discuss the Provost's recommendations	Within 30 days of receiving the final report, or as soon thereafter as practicable
Program Leader	Meets with program faculty to discuss review and recommendations, and to begin work on program action plan	June 15, review year
Program Leader and program faculty	Submit action plan	October 1, year after review
Program Leader and program faculty	Submit action plan updates	Annually
Provost	Provides review summary to WOU Board, Faculty Senate	October or January (BOT), October (FS), year after review

DRAFT

External reviewers Guidelines and Guidance

Selection of external 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 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

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.

Table 4: Sections taught

	Total	% Lower division	Av class size	% low enr	% Upper division	Av class size	% low enr	% Graduate	Av class size	% low enr
All Sections										
Tenure-track taught										
Non-tenure track taught										

Table 5: Costs

Total Program	Faculty	Support Staff (Share of Division support staff)	Operations (Share of Division operations)

Table 4: Sections taught

	Total	% Lower division	Av class size	% low enr	% Upper division	Av class size	% low enr	% Graduate	Av class size	% low enr
All Sections										
Tenure-track taught										
Non-tenure track taught										

Table 5: Costs

Total Program	Faculty	Support Staff (Share of Division support staff)	Operations (Share of Division operations)