Weber State University
Five Year Program Review
Reviewer Guide and Worksheets

Dear Program Review Committee Member,

Thank you for your willingness to participate on the committee to review one of Weber State University's academic programs. Whether you have come from across the country, within the state, or from here on campus your support and expertise are appreciated and valued. This document contains guidelines, instructions, and worksheets for the program review visit. You may complete either an electronic or a hard copy version of this document.

If you have questions about the review process prior to your visit, feel free to contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at (801) 626-8586.

Name of program under review: _____

Name of reviewer: _____

Reviewer affiliation: _____

Contents

Purpose of Program Review

The primary purpose of program review at WSU is to improve academic programs. An academic program may consist of an entire department which houses several majors, or an academic program may be a component of a department.

Program reviews are not conducted to expressly identify individual programs for discontinuance. Reviews will result in an identification of program strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for change. The program faculty, responsible academic dean, and provost will respond in writing to these recommendations as part of a program-improvement plan.

Responsibilities of Program Review Committee

The program review committee is charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Review of the content of the program to ensure that it is consistent with high standards and practices within the discipline.
2. Review resources (faculty, facilities and selected budgets, such as travel budgets) to ensure that they are consistent with supporting a quality program.
3. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the program.
4. Note any concerns or recommendations about the rates of recruitment of new students, placement of graduates and sensitivity to community and professional needs.
5. Review sufficiency of the evidence of student learning.

Program Review Process

Program reviews are generally conducted on a 5 year cycle. Exceptions to this schedule may occur as a result of previous review recommendations or outside accreditation schedules.

The faculty representing a department scheduled for 5 year program review develops an extensive self-study report during the fall semester. The final self-study report goes through a series of approvals culminating with sign off from the Dean of the appropriate college. The purpose of the self-study is twofold. First, it provides an opportunity for department faculty to collaborate at a program-level perspective to consider their programs and the status or 'health' of those programs. Second, the self-study document is sent to members of the program review committee to provide them with information and background about the program under study, to help those individuals become better acquainted with the program they are being asked to evaluate.

At the conclusion of the site visit, recommendations and commendations are compiled by the site visit team chair and presented in a report to the department chair. The chair shares the report with the program faculty who is then given an opportunity to formally respond to that report. All reports and responses are then forwarded to the appropriate Dean who also develops a response.

At the beginning of the fall semester following the site visit, the Dean's response along with the self-study, review recommendations/commendations, and faculty response are forwarded to the Provost's Office. Program reviews are then distributed to the institutional reviewing committee (often the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) and a formal review is scheduled with this committee and the department chair(s). The department chair makes a presentation to the committee; the committee asks questions of the department chair; finally, the committee makes a recommendation to the Provost about the program under review.

The final step is development of program review reports by the Provost for distribution to and consideration by the university's Board of Trustees and the Utah State Board of Regents. These reports are developed and delivered during the spring semester.

Self-study Format and Standards

The most critical element of program review is the self-study that is prepared by the program faculty. The self-study document is both a description and an analysis of important aspects of an academic program. Once this document has been completed, it is reviewed and approved by the responsible Academic Dean prior to its dissemination. The self-study is approximately 25-30 pages in length, exclusive of appendices, and should follow the format described below. An executive summary of the self-study is also prepared by the Program Faculty. This summary document is 3-5 pages in length, exclusive of the appendices and includes brief information about the program under review.

Executive Summary

- Mission Statement
- Curriculum - types of degrees, number of courses, admissions process
- Student learning outcomes and assessment
- Academic Advising
- Faculty
- Program Support
- Relationships with the External Community
- Student, Faculty, Contract/Adjunct Faculty and Staff statistical summaries (Data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research)
- Information of review team members (name - current position - place of employment - contact information)

Self-study Format

I. Cover Sheet/Title Page
II. Program Review Elements and Standards
    A. Mission Statement
    B. Curriculum
        1. Curriculum Map
    C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
        1. Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses
        2. Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major
        3. Evidence of Learning: High Impact Service Learning
    D. Academic Advising
    E. Faculty
    F. Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)
    G. Relationships with the External Communities
    H. Results of Previous Program Reviews
III. Appendices
    A. Student and Faculty Statistical Summary
    B. Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile
    C. Staff Profile
    D. Financial Analysis Summary
    E. Relationships with External Communities
    F. Additional information as determined by Program

Program Evaluation Worksheet

FOR USE BY PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

This form is to be used by each team member to record program data and information during the team visit. The following quality ratings are suggested:

S Strength; especially effective practice or condition

A Adequate; meets expected standards

C Concern; action could be needed in the future

W Weakness; action needed

X Did not evaluate – indicate why the area was not evaluated.

At the conclusion of the visit, leave the original of this form with the team chair, who will use it to prepare the draft statement for the institution.

STANDARD A - MISSION STATEMENT

Evaluate how effectively the mission statement articulates the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The expected outcomes of the program need to be clearly defined.		
b.	A process by which these accomplishments are determined and periodically assessed based upon the constituencies served by the program.		
c.	A clearly defined educational program, including a curriculum that enables graduates to achieve the mission.		
d.	The program mission statement must be appropriate to and support the mission statements of both the college housing the program and the university.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD B – CURRICULUM

Evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program should demonstrate that the curriculum for each degree and for any general education/service courses offered by the program is the result of thoughtful curriculum planning and review processes.		
b.	The curriculum should be consistent with the program's mission.		
c.	The program should be able to demonstrate that there is an appropriate allocation of resources for curriculum delivery that is consistent with the mission of the program, the number of graduates, and the number of major/minor and general education SCHs produced.		
d.	Courses to support the major/minor/general education/service programs are offered on a regular basis to ensure students are able to complete graduation requirements in a timely manner.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD C - STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Evaluate the extent to which the program has clearly defined outcomes.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	Learning outcomes should describe the expected knowledge, skills, and behaviors that students will have achieved at the time of graduation (overarching program goals).		
b.	Learning outcomes must support the goals of the program and the constituencies served.		
c.	Learning outcomes should be directly linked to the program's curriculum. An explicit curriculum grid illustrating this alignment, as well as the depth to which each course addresses each outcome, is publicly available.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

Evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment process based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a developed set of measures for assessment that are clearly defined and appropriately applied.		
b.	Each learning outcome is assessed with *at least one direct measure* of learning; thresholds for acceptable performance are defined (for each measure) and published.		
c.	Demonstrate that evidence of learning is being gathered on a regular basis across the program, that the evidence is aggregated, and reported at the aggregate.		
d.	Demonstrate that these measures are being used in a systematic manner on a regular basis and are reviewed against department-established thresholds, i.e., are the program faculty meeting regularly to discuss the evidence?		
e.	Demonstrate that the assessment of the program mission and student outcomes is being used to improve and further develop the program. Is the evidence acted upon? Is it clear what drives program change?		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD D - ACADEMIC ADVISING

Evaluate the following related to the advising process.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program has a clearly defined strategy for advising their major/minor, or BIS students that is continually assessed for its effectiveness.		
b.	Students receive appropriate assistance in planning their individual programs of study.		
c.	Students receive needed assistance in making career decisions and in seeking placement, whether in employment or graduate school.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD E – FACULTY

Evaluate the extent to which the faculty demonstrates the following characteristics.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	Faculty size, composition, qualifications, and professional development activities must result from a planning process which is consistent with the program's mission.		
b.	The program maintains a core of full-time faculty sufficient to provide stability and ongoing quality improvement for the degree programs offered.		
c.	Contract/adjunct faculty who provide instruction to students (day/evening, off/on campus) are academically and professionally qualified.		
d.	The program should demonstrate efforts to achieve demographic diversity in its faculty.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
e.	The program should have appropriate procedures for the orientation of new contract/adjunct faculty.		
f.	Processes are in place to determine appropriate teaching assignments and service workloads, to guide and mentor contract/adjunct faculty, and to provide adequate support for activities which implement the program's mission.		
g.	Teaching is systematically monitored to assess its effectiveness, and revised periodically to reflect new objectives and to incorporate improvements based on appropriate assessment methods. For both contract and adjunct faculty, there is evidence of: • Effective creation and delivery of instruction. • Ongoing evaluation and improvement of instruction. • Innovation in instructional processes.		
h.	A formal, periodic review process exists for all faculty, and the results of the reviews are available.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD F - PROGRAM SUPPORT

Evaluate the nature and adequacy of the program support based on the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The number and capabilities of the support staff are adequate to meet the mission and objectives of the program.		
b.	Administrative support is present in assisting in the selection and development of support staff.		
c.	The facilities, equipment, and library support needs are adequate to meet the mission and goals of the program.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD G - RELATIONSHIPS WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES

Evaluate the relationships according to the following elements.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	If there are formal relationships between the program and external communities of interest they should be clearly defined.		
b.	Such relationships should have a clearly defined role and evidence of their contribution to the program (curriculum, equipment, faculty, budget, etc.) should be demonstrated.		
c.	If the program has an external advisory committee, it should meet regularly and minutes of the meetings be made available.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

STANDARD H - PROGRAM SUMMARY

Evaluate the effectiveness of the program to implement recommendations and make changes based on previous reviews.

	Element	Rating	Comments and/or Recommendations for Change
a.	The program must show how it has implemented any recommendations from the previous review and what effect these changes had on the program. If any recommendations were not implemented the program should explain why they were not put into place.		

Rating: S = Strength, A = Adequate, C = Concern, W = Weakness, X = did not evaluate (please indicate why)

Please include any other notes you feel are relevant to your review of the program:

Notes:

Suggested Questions for Program Review Evaluation Team Members

Questions for program department chair

1. What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the program?
2. How are program goals and objectives assessed?
3. Whom does the program serve?
4. What are the special/unique features of the program?
5. What relationships exist between the program and external communities?
6. Is there an advisory committee? Is it active? What is the meeting frequency?
7. Are any major curriculum changes planned? What? When to implement?
8. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?
9. How much time and what resources are available to the faculty for professional development?
10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the various support departments?
11. Who is responsible for certifying that students have completed requirements before graduating?
12. What are the hiring criteria for adjunct faculty?
13. What type of new faculty orientation is provided to full-time and adjunct faculty?
14. How is the effectiveness of faculty determined in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship?
15. What are the program's advising procedures?

Questions for individual faculty members

1. How much time and what resources are available for professional development?
2. How many faculty members teach in this program?
3. Is the administration supportive of the program?
4. Does the program provide appropriate procedures for orientation of new faculty?
5. What professional organizations are you a member of? Are you active? Hold any offices?
6. What are the student learning outcomes for this program? How are they assessed?
7. How are the results of the student learning outcomes assessment used?
8. How do you go about obtaining needed equipment?
9. Is there an effective process for faculty evaluation?
10. What unique or unusual teaching methods are used in your department?
11. Are there formal relationships between the program and external communities?
12. What is the role of the faculty in curriculum revision?
13. What changes should be made to improve the program? To improve the facilities?
14. What advising opportunities are available to the students?
15. What is the role of the faculty in student advising?
16. Is there adequate secretarial and computing service available to you for preparing examinations, handouts, demonstrations, etc.?
17. How large are the classes?
18. Is a continuous improvement plan in place? How is it impacting the curriculum?

Questions for students – groups or individual

1. Are the faculty members in the program competent in their fields?
2. Are faculty members available to you at times convenient to you?
3. Are adequate advisement opportunities made available to you?
4. If you have laboratories, are they well equipped? Do you get hands-on experience?
5. Do instructors provide effective delivery of instruction?
6. Do you plan to continue your education after graduation? When? Where?
7. Do you plan to accept a job after graduation? When? Where?
8. What is your overall view of the program? Would you recommend it to a friend?

Program Review Evaluation Team Report Guidelines

The Program Review Evaluation Team generally appoints one member of the team to prepare a 3-5 page narrative report, consistent with the self-study standards, addressing all self-study standards (A-H, see below), which identifies the following:

- program strengths - referencing Standard where appropriate
- program challenges – reference standards where appropriate
- program weaknesses - areas where the program did not meet the standards and why - reference standards
- recommendations for change - suggested changes for meeting the standards
- additional recommendations from the review team

Please be explicit about strengths, challenges, and weaknesses.

Standards:
A. Mission Statement
B. Curriculum
C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
D. Academic Advising
E. Faculty
F. Support (Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment, and Library)
G. Relationships with the External Communities
H. Results of Previous Program Reviews