

Academic Program Review: A Guide for Participants –June 13, 2005

Approved by the Academic Senate

Contact Person: Doug Haneline hanelind@ferris.edu

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: A GUIDE FOR PARTICIPANTS

**Division of Academic Affairs/Academic Senate
Ferris State University
Big Rapids, Michigan 49307**

Initiated 1988

**Revised 1994-95, 1998, 2000-01, 2004-05, 2005-
2006**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: DEGREE PROGRAMS

I. Program Review Mission and Goals

A. Mission Statement of Ferris State University

Ferris State University will be national leader in providing opportunities for innovative teaching and learning in career-oriented, technological and professional education.

B. Program Review Process Origin and Philosophy

Academic program review has been present at Ferris since 1988. It fulfills one of the criteria that the University must meet for regional accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association (NCA). According to the *Handbook of Accreditation 3/e*, Core Component 2c of Criterion Two (Preparing for the Future) is as follows: “The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.” As part of a larger institutional system that collects, disseminates, and evaluates institutional information, an effective academic program review process thus provides evidence that the University meets the criterion. Academic program review processes across the United States are administered by both (or either) administration and faculty.

Career oriented education is the core of the mission of Ferris State University. The instruction that meets this goal occurs primarily at the program level, and it is essential to maintain and improve the quality of the programs in the University. Therefore, an effective academic program review process is essential for the health of the University’s degree programs. A degree program is a set of courses the completion of which leads to the awarding of a degree.

Any complex organization such as a University is composed of a number of constituencies with different responsibilities and perspectives. Three major constituencies in the University are the students, the faculty, and the administration. The primary responsibility of the students is to obtain an education. The faculty provides instruction and guides the learning of those students. The administration is responsible for the management of the University and providing an environment and the resources necessary for the faculty to carry out its responsibilities to students. Clear and continuing communication among these constituencies is essential for optimal function of the University and for an effective academic program review process.

It is the obligation of the faculty and administration to ensure quality education for students enrolled at the University. At Ferris State University academic program review is a collaborative process that is largely faculty driven. The process described in this document requires the formation of a program review panel (composed predominantly of faculty) which is charged with collecting data concerning the program, evaluation of that data, and making recommendations with regard to future direction of the program based on its findings. The Program Review Panel (PRP) report is

submitted to the Academic Program Review Council (APRC) which is a standing committee of the Academic Senate composed of faculty representing all academic units. The APRC evaluates the report and meets with the PRP for a discussion of the report. The APRC then makes recommendations to the Academic Senate which is composed of faculty representing all academic divisions of the University. The Academic Senate acts on the recommendations of the APRC and forwards its recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The central role the faculty in the academic program review process does not diminish the importance of input from or supplant the responsibilities of other constituencies in the University. During the process of preparing its report, the PRP solicits input from other stakeholders, including current students, alumni, employers of graduates, advisory committee members, faculty members who teach in the program, the Department Head/Chair, and the Dean. In addition, the Administrative Program Review document which is prepared annually by the immediate administrator of the program for the Vice President for Academic Affairs serves as a focal point in the panel report. The Department Head/Chair and the Dean are involved with the development and writing of the report throughout the process. They are also invited to present their views by meeting with the APRC. The recommendations of the Academic Senate are submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Based on the recommendations of the Academic Senate, the PRP report, the APRC recommendations, and any other documentation, the Vice President for Academic Affairs makes recommendations to the University President concerning each Program. The University President may accept the recommendation of the VPAA or disagree with them.

Implementation of the recommendations made by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and approved by the President with respect to curricular matters is the responsibility of the faculty in the program, the Department Head/Chair, and Dean of the College. Allocation of fiscal and human resources necessary to implement the recommendations is at the discretion of the administration.

II. An Overview of the Academic Program Review Process

A. Goals of Academic Program Review

It is at the program level at which the mission of Ferris State University to provide “learning in career-oriented, technological and professional education” is truly accomplished. As a consequence, programs must respond to advances in knowledge and changes in the workplace and technology if the University is to maintain its vitality. The academic program review process provides an opportunity for the faculty and administration to evaluate the goals and effectiveness of the program and make appropriate changes that will lead to improvement in the quality of instruction, improved career and life preparation for students, and effective use of University resources.

The goals of academic program review include:

1. Assist programs in identification, evaluation and assessment of their mission and goals
2. Assist programs in determination of their relationship to the Mission of Ferris State University

3. Assist programs in evaluation of their effectiveness in preparing students for a career or further education
4. Assist programs in assessing the quality of instruction, evaluation of instructional methodology and identifying strengths and weaknesses in their curriculum
5. Assist programs in identification of existing resources and determination of the resources needed to carry out their mission and goals
6. Contribute to the effort of the University to build a culture of academic quality and excellence, including the goals of good citizenship and understanding of diversity.
7. Assist the University in evaluation of the viability, value, quality, effectiveness and efficient use of resources for the academic programs at Ferris State University
8. Provide direction and priorities for the University that can be used for needs assessment, resource allocation, and planning
9. Provide structure, a plan of action, and information for continuous program improvement

B. Report Guidelines Summary

The following guidelines should be used in conducting program reviews. These guidelines should help (1) reduce the amount of documentation required in the program review process and (2) focus the review on program goals, how well the program has done to date in meeting these goals, and the future actions needed to meet the goals.

These guidelines are:

1. The report will be goal-oriented. Specific goals should be stated for the program and the attainment of those goals should be the focus of the program review report. The goals should reflect the University's mission and the departmental, college and divisional strategic plans.
2. The report will look at the program as a whole. The focus will be on the program, not on individual courses.
3. The report will be forward-looking. It will focus not only on where the program has been but also on where the program wishes to go (its goals). Using data provided to or generated by the department, it will analyze and assess whether the goals are appropriate to the discipline, the needs of students in the program, etc.
4. The focus of the report will be both descriptive and assessment-oriented. The report will evaluate progress toward program goals rather than merely document the status of the program. It will analyze available data, both quantitative and qualitative, that has been provided to or generated by the department, to assess the program's progress in meeting its goals. (For example, do responses from employers indicate the program is successfully preparing its graduates for the workplace, if such preparation is one of the goals of the program?)
5. Recommendations will be expressed in terms of action. Recommendations for action will indicate who will do what specific tasks, and when.
6. The Program Review process will be continuous.

C. Summary of Procedure

The review process for a program begins in the fall semester of the year before the program report is due. The first steps in the process are the selection of a review panel, development of a review plan, and the creation of a budget. Following approval of the makeup of the panel by the APRC and approval of the budget by the Office of Academic Affairs, the review panel develops surveys for program alumni, current students, employers, advisory committee members, and faculty. The panel then conducts the surveys. In sessions that include both the Dean and the Department Head/Chair, information gathered from the surveys is summarized, analyzed, and used to draft the various sections of the report. The final report will include sections written by the Department Head/Chair and the Dean. The PRP Chair coordinates the development of a schedule that delineates responsibility and deadlines for completion of writing the APR report.

The final report is due June 15th, two semesters after the process is initiated. It is the responsibility of the Dean and the Department Head/Chair to see that the deadline is met. The APRC reads the report and, following this initial review of the written description of the program, meets with the panel to discuss the report and the program. Information gathered from the report and the interview with the panel is used to formulate a recommendation for the program including suggestions for program improvement. This recommendation is forwarded to the Academic Senate, usually in mid-November, for its consideration. (At the same time, the Department Head/Chair, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs receive copies of the recommendation.) After the Senate acts on the recommendation, it is then passed on to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Steps to implement the recommendation and program improvements are considered and acted on by the VPAA, President, and Board of Trustees of the University. Implementation of the recommendations is the responsibility of the faculty of the program, the Department Head/Chair, the Dean of the College, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

III. Policy: The Academic Program Review Process

A. Academic Program Review Council

Members of the Academic Program Review Council (APRC) are appointed for three-year renewable terms by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. The Council shall include the following:

Eleven faculty members, preferably tenured:

- one from each college,
- one FLITE librarian, and
- two at large.

No more than two faculty members from any one college should serve on the APRC.

The APRC Chair is appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for a one-year term.

The APRC normally operates as a committee of the whole. To facilitate timely and effective review, however, the APRC can at its discretion divide itself into subcommittees. Though some reviewing

work may be split among subcommittees, decisions made by the subcommittees will be ratified by the APRC as a whole.

B. Creating the Program Review Panel

Each fall the Academic Program Review Council (APRC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, notifies the programs which are scheduled for review that academic year.

Each program (or cluster of programs) which is scheduled for review must form a Program Review Panel (PRP). The Department Head/Chair will convene a meeting with the faculty to provide input on membership selection for the Program Review Panel (PRP) of which he/she is a member. The PRP Chair must be a faculty member. The names of PRP members should be submitted to APRC as soon as the panel is formed.

The panel shall consist of the following:

1. A faculty member, preferably tenured and from the program, to chair the PRP. APRC will seek the advice of the Department Head/Chair and faculty in appointing the Chair. The Chair has principal responsibility for writing the report. It is suggested that the Chair be available during the summer.
2. The Program Coordinator, and the Head/Chair of the department in which the program is located.
3. Two program faculty, where possible.
4. An individual with special interest in the program. This person could be an alumnus/na, an advisory committee member, an adjunct faculty member, or an interested faculty member from outside the program.
5. A faculty member from outside the college.

C. Preparing the Budget

The VPAA will annually set aside a designated amount of funds for each program panel (see appendix for break down of expenses). The Department Head/Chair will notify the VPAA concerning the account number into which the funds will be transferred. If the PRP believes that its process will exceed the designated amount, it may submit to the VPAA (with a copy to the Chair of APRC) a budget containing all anticipated expenses the panel may incur in the process of gathering data and preparing the report. Typically these expenses include such items as copying, telephone, clerical, and postage. After the VPAA's office has approved a budget, the necessary funds will be transferred from Academic Affairs into the account from which the department will pay the expenses of the review.

D. Designing the Research Plan and Survey Instruments

The Program Review Panel (PRP) will meet as soon as possible after its formation to undertake the following tasks:

1. Review the information contained in the Administrative Program Review document.
2. Develop a statement in which the purpose and scope of the review are articulated.
3. Assign a leader and a target date for each of the activities in the list that follows:
 - Graduate follow-up survey
 - Employer follow-up survey
 - Student (graduating and current) evaluation of program
 - Faculty perceptions of program
 - Advisory committee perceptions of program
 - Labor market analysis
 - Evaluation of facilities and equipment
 - Curriculum evaluation
4. Determine data collection techniques and information sources. The survey instruments must be designed and distributed, in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing, to reflect general aspects of program review as well as the specific nature of the program itself. The panel must determine the number of individuals in each category to be surveyed. It is important that the results of these surveys be statistically valid.
5. Submit an evaluation plan to the APRC Chair (see sample plan on page xx).

The APRC will review the plan using criteria of soundness and ability to generate sufficient data to support conclusions. The Chairs of the APRC and the PRP will work out any plan deficiencies.

E. Preparing the Evaluation Plan

The PRP should prepare an Evaluation Plan using the format of the sample document (see Appendix) and submit it to the Chair of the APRC for approval.

F. Style Guide Suggestions

The program review process can be made more efficient and effective by presentation of a well written and organized report. The Chair of the APRC has examples of past reports. These may provide ideas for presentation and organization. The following suggestions may also help in preparing the report.

- Include a table of contents including section names, subsection names, and page numbers.
- Use tabs or dividers to indicate sections.

- Use consecutive page numbers within each section of the report.
- Label pages with both section and page numbers.
- Present all numerical data in both text discussion and table formats. Include analysis/interpretation of all data. Include both raw numbers and percentages.

G. Yearly Administrative Review

An effective program review process is not possible without a reliable database. It is essential that a profile be maintained for every academic program in the University. Through the offices of the deans and Department Heads/Chairs, the VPAA will annually prepare a profile of each academic program. This information (see sample document: *Yearly Administrative Review*, in Appendix) will be updated annually.

H. Writing the Program Review Panel Report

Each PRP will conduct its review in accordance with the approved plan and should include the elements described in IV: Report Content Guidelines.

The development and writing of the report should follow these guidelines:

- After the PRP collects the data, it will provide the results from the data collection phase to the Dean.
- The PRP will invite the Dean to attend a meeting in which the results of the analyses are discussed and input is solicited from all individuals in attendance regarding the general health of the program, future goals, adequacy of resource allocation, and recommendations for program rating.
- PRP Chair will coordinate the development of a schedule that delineates responsibility and deadlines for completion of writing the APR report.
- The PRP Chair will call meetings during the report writing phase to provide members of the PRP an opportunity to critically discuss and edit the draft as needed throughout the compilation of the document
- The Department Head/Chair will submit a draft of his/her analysis of the health of the program, future goals, and adequacy of resource allocation for inclusion in the APR report. This draft will include a discussion of his/her perception of the relationship of the program to the Ferris State University mission; the program's visibility and distinctiveness; the program's value; the characteristics, quality and employability of students in the program; the quality of curriculum and instruction, composition and quality of the faculty; and the adequacy of facilities and equipment. Necessary supporting data should be included.
- The PRP will provide a near final draft of the report, including the Department Head/Chair's analysis, to the Dean for review.
- The Dean will submit a draft of his/her analysis of the health of the program, future goals, and adequacy of resource allocation for inclusion in the report. This draft will include a

discussion of his/her perception of the relationship of the program to the Ferris State University mission; the program's visibility and distinctiveness; the program's value; the characteristics, quality and employability of students in the program; the quality of curriculum and instruction, composition and quality of the faculty; and the adequacy of facilities and equipment. Necessary supporting data should be included.

- The PRP will invite the Dean to attend a meeting in which the report is discussed by all individuals in attendance.
- The PRP is responsible for editing and submitting the final report to the APRC. It is the responsibility of the Department Head/Chair and the Dean to ensure that the report is submitted by the designated deadline.

I. Submitting the Report

Each PRP will conduct its review in accordance with the approved plan and will submit 14 copies of the report contained in a 3-ring notebook to the Chair of the APRC. The report should be able to fit in a notebook no thicker than 1 ½" to 2" in thickness. A complete copy of the report will be transmitted electronically to the Chair of the APRC so that it may be posted on the Academic Senate webpage and transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. At the same time the report is sent to the APRC, a paper copy will be sent to the Department Head/Chair and the Dean of the College.

A functioning academic program review process is a requirement of the University's institutional accreditation, and in the event that a PRP fails to submit a report, or submits an unsatisfactory report, APRC will review available data and make appropriate recommendations regarding the future of the program.

J. APRC Review of the PRP Reports

After the APRC reviews and analyzes the PRP report, which includes sections written by the Department Head/Chair and Dean of the College, the APRC will meet with members of the PRP to discuss the report. The APRC may submit written questions concerning the report to the PRP prior to the meeting in order to clarify information presented in the report. The PRP is encouraged to invite the Dean to this meeting. If the PRP elects to meet separately with the APRC, the Dean will be invited to meet at another time with the APRC.

K. APRC Recommendation

The APRC will submit to the President of the Academic Senate its recommendation regarding the program under review. The recommendation should do the following:

1. Assign one of the ratings (see the list in L) to the program with respect to its future status.
2. Articulate the determinants which involved the assignment of a particular rating to the program. The strengths and deficiencies of the program should be elucidated in such a fashion that their impact in arriving at the assigned rating is clear.

3. In cases other than discontinuation of the program, specify actions needed to correct the weaknesses of the program and enhance its strengths. Additionally, measures to be taken that are consistent with the assigned rating must be presented. In the case of a program slated for enhancement, the APRC should specifically state the actions it recommends to arrive at such an outcome.

The PRP Chair, the Department Head/Chair, the College Dean, and the VPAA shall receive copies of the APRC's recommendations at the same time they are sent to the President of the Academic Senate. The APRC will meet with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the VPAA prior to the dissemination of the recommendations to the full Academic Senate.

L. Program Review Ratings

Ratings are assigned based on the program's status with regard to the following categories (found in IV: Section 5):

- Relationship to FSU Mission
- Program Visibility and Distinctiveness
- Program Value
- Enrollment
- Characteristics, Quality, and Employability of Students
- Quality of Curriculum and Instruction
- Composition and Quality of the Faculty

Continue the Program: The program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. Minor modifications may be needed.

Continue the Program with Enhancement: The program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. The program's status with regard to several of the categories is significantly high, and its less satisfactory status with regard to the other categories could be significantly improved by the allocation of additional resources. Such a program enhancement may involve additional faculty/staff, equipment, or other resources and/or expansion in enrollment.

Continue the Program with Reporting: The program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. However, documented problem areas exist, and the faculty and administration of the program will be asked to report as to their progress in solving these problems.

Continue the Program with Redirection: The program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation. However, the program needs a curricular redirection, and the faculty and administration of the program will be asked to report as to their progress in carrying out this redirection.

Continue the Program with Reduction: Although the program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report merits continuation, the program lacks visibility and distinctiveness, the job market for its graduates is diminishing, or enrollment is declining precipitously. It should therefore be reduced in enrollment capacity or resources.

Discontinue the Program: The program's status with respect to the categories in Section 5 of the report is such that evidence suggests that the program should be terminated.

M. Academic Senate Recommendation

The Academic Senate will discuss the recommendation submitted by APRC. At the conclusion of Academic Senate deliberations on each program, the President of the Academic Senate will submit the Senate's recommendation to the VPAA.

N. VPAA's Recommendation

The VPAA will review the recommendation of the Academic Senate, the PRP report, and any other relevant documentation compiled during the APRC and Academic Senate deliberations. Prior to sending his or her recommendation to the University President, the VPAA may choose to discuss the recommendation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. No recommendation can come from the Executive Committee that is different from the one voted by the Academic Senate.

O. University President's Recommendation

The University President may accept the recommendation of the VPAA or disagree with it. He or she must inform the President of the Academic Senate of his/her decision regarding the program under review. **If** the University President's decision is in conflict with the Academic Senate's recommendation **and if** the decision involves the reduction or discontinuation of a program, a conference committee shall be formed in accordance with Section 8 of the Charter of the Academic Senate.

P. Implementation of Recommendations

Academic program review cannot be effective without appropriate implementation of recommendations. This requires feedback from and accountability by both faculty and administration. Failure to address and/or follow through on recommendations brings into question the value of the process of academic program review.

For programs with ratings of **Continue**, **Continue with Enhancement**, **Continue with Reporting**, or **Continue with Redirection**, the following steps are to be taken, using the provided database for ease of communication:

1. Creation of an action plan

- a) The Department Head/Chair will invite the Dean and the PRP to discuss the development of an action plan based on the recommendation of the VPAA. The action plan will include delineation of action steps, which individuals will be responsible for completing the action steps, a timeline for completion of the action steps, and budgetary and other resources needed.
- b) The PRP will complete the development of a draft action plan and submit it to the Dean within ten working days after the start of the semester when the APR report was submitted.
- c) The Dean will meet with the PRP within ten working days to discuss the draft action plan, including recommendations for revision.
- d) The PRP will forward a final action plan to the Dean and the Chair of APRC within ten working days after discussion of the draft.
- e) The Dean will make a recommendation to accept, reject, or modify the action plan within ten working days and forward the recommendation, and his/her rationale for the recommendation, to the PRP, the Chair of APRC and the VPAA.
- f) The VPAA will make a recommendation to accept, reject, or modify the action plan within ten working days and forward the recommendation, and his/her rationale for the recommendation, to the PRP, the Chair of APRC, the Dean, and the President.

2. Request for approval of resources needed to implement an action plan

- a) The Department Head/Chair will convene the PRP to review the final action plan approved by the VPAA.
- b) The Department Head/Chair will submit a request to the Dean by the appropriate deadline for approval of budgetary and other resources needed for implementation of the action plan.
- c) The Dean will submit a request to the VPAA by the appropriate deadline for approval of resources needed for implementation of the action plan.
- d) The Department Head/Chair will convene the PRP to modify request for budgetary and other resources if circumstances warrant such a modification.

3. Implementation of an action plan

- a) The Department Head/Chair will meet at least monthly with the Program Coordinator and/or faculty to review completion of steps within the action plan until the plan is completed.
- b) The Department Head/Chair will meet with the Dean at least monthly to review completion of steps within the action plan.
- c) The Dean will meet at least monthly with the VPAA to report completion of steps within the action plan.
- d) The VPAA will make a biannual report to the Academic Senate on completion of action plan steps.
- e) APRC will post progress made toward completion of action plan steps on the Academic Senate webpage.

For programs with ratings of **Continue with Reduction** or **Discontinue the Program**, the creation and implementation of an action plan is the same except that in programs in which reduction is recommended, Steps 2 b)-d) should be omitted. For programs in which discontinuation is recommended, the following should be addressed in Step 1 a) of the creation of an action plan:

- Assessment of the status of current students in the program
- Delineation of a plan for students to complete the program of study
- Determination of a schedule of classes to allow students to complete the program
- Determination of a process whereby technical equipment and supply inventory can be liquidated

Q. Review Schedule

The Chair of APRC and the VPAA (with the advice of the College Deans) will update the program review schedule annually, listing the programs to be reviewed over a six-year period. Programs with curricular links (for example, associate and baccalaureate programs in the same area, or all teacher education programs) should be combined into a single review. Reviews of programs with external accrediting bodies should be scheduled so that the information developed can be used for both institutional and external reviews. The Department Head/Chair should inform the Dean of the dates when programs will undergo accreditation review so that the Dean can communicate that information to the VPAA, who will adjust the review calendar so that the program can coordinate completion of review documents for both the accreditation and APR processes.

As much as possible, the reviews should be evenly spaced over the six years of the cycle. During the sixth year of each cycle, the VPAA should prepare a new schedule for the next six-year cycle. The VPAA will add new programs into the cycle as they are approved.

R. Reviews Outside of the Established Schedule

Should circumstances arise such that an unscheduled review is thought to be necessary, such a review can be requested by either the program faculty or the VPAA. When an unscheduled review is requested by either party, the appropriate justification and documentation supporting the need for, depth of, and timetable required for a review must be communicated to the APRC. The APRC must advise the VPAA, the President of the Academic Senate, and the program faculty of its decision to make an unscheduled review and the timetable for that review.

The APRC's decision to **allow** an unscheduled review of a program is final and may not be appealed. However, if the APRC does not agree to an unscheduled review, it must justify its **refusal** to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate may override the APRC's **refusal** to make an unscheduled review.

If the Academic Senate concurs with the APRC's **refusal** to make an unscheduled program review, it must advise the University President of its decision. The University President may override this **refusal** and a review will be scheduled within a reasonable timeframe.

IV. Report Content Guidelines

Section 1: An overview of the program that addresses broadly the areas of the program included in the Administrative Program Review document (see page xx). This section should acquaint the

reader with the program: mission, history, impact (on the University, state, and nation), expectations, plans for improvement, and any other items that would help the reader fully appreciate the remainder of the report.

A. PROGRAM GOALS.

- 1) State the goals of the program.
- 2) Explain how and by whom the goals were established.
- 3) How do the goals apply to preparing students for careers in and meeting employer needs in the community/region/marketplace?
- 4) Have the goals changed since the last program review? If so, why and how? If not, why not?
- 5) Describe the relationship of the program goals to the University's mission, and the departmental, college and divisional strategic plans.

B. PROGRAM VISIBILITY AND DISTINCTIVENESS

- 1) Describe any unique features or components of the program.
- 2) Describe and assess the program's ability to attract quality students.
- 3) Identify the institutions that are the main competitors for prospective students in this program.
 - a) How are these programs similar and different from the FSU program?
 - b) What can be learned from them that would improve the program at Ferris?

C. PROGRAM RELEVANCE.

- 1) Provide a labor market demand analysis: This activity is designed to assess the marketability of future graduates. Reports from the Department of Labor and from industry are excellent sources for forecasting demand on graduates. Request information from your Library Liaison.
- 2) Describe and assess how the program responds to emerging issues in the discipline, changes in the labor force, changes in employer needs, changes in student needs, and other forces of change.
- 3) Assess why students come to FSU for the program. Summarize the results of the graduate exit survey and the student program evaluation.
 - a) How well does the program meet student expectations?
 - b) How is student sentiment measured?

D. PROGRAM VALUE. Please refer to the faculty survey.

- 1) Describe the benefit of the program, facilities, and personnel to the University.
- 2) Describe the benefit of the program facilities, and personnel to the students enrolled in the program.
- 3) What is the assessment of program personnel of the value of the program to employers? Explain how is this value is determined.
- 4) Describe the benefit of the program, faculty, staff and facilities to entities external to the University (services that faculty have provided to accreditation bodies, and regional, state, and national professional associations; manuscript reviewing; service on editorial boards; use of facilities for meetings, etc.).

- 5) What services for extra-University general public groups (e.g., presentations in schools or to community organizations) have faculty, staff or students provided? Describe how these services benefit students, program, and community.

Section 2: Collection of Perceptions. The survey sections must include, among others, a discussion of techniques used in collecting the information, difficulties encountered during the surveying process, number and percent of respondents, and analysis of data in accordance with established methodologies. The survey instruments must be designed and distributed, in consultation with Institutional Research and Testing, to reflect general aspects of program review as well as the specific nature of the program itself. All comments should be included, but the names of individuals mentioned should be deleted.

- A. **Graduate follow-up survey:** The purpose of this activity is to learn from the graduates their perceptions and experiences regarding employment based on program outcomes. The goal is to assess the effectiveness of the program in terms of job placement and preparedness of the graduate for the marketplace. A mailed or e-mailed questionnaire is most preferred; however, under certain conditions telephone or personal interviews can be used to gather the data.
- B. **Employer follow-up survey:** This activity is intended to aid in assessing the employers' experiences with graduates and their perceptions of the program itself. A mailed or e-mailed instrument should be used to conduct the survey; however, if justified, telephone or personal interviews may suffice.
- C. **Graduating student exit survey:** Graduating students are surveyed every year on an ongoing basis to obtain information regarding quality of instruction, relevance of courses, and satisfaction with program outcomes based on their own expectations. The survey must seek student suggestions on ways to improve the effectiveness of the program and to enhance the fulfillment of their expectations. This survey is mandatory for all program graduates.
- D. **Student program evaluation:** Current students are surveyed to obtain information regarding quality of instruction, relevance of courses, and satisfaction with program outcomes based on their own expectations. The survey must seek student suggestions on ways to improve the effectiveness of the program and to enhance the fulfillment of their expectations. This survey should be conducted during the year before the PRP report is submitted.
- E. **Faculty perceptions:** The purpose of this activity is to assess faculty perceptions regarding the following aspects of the program: curriculum, resources, admissions standards, degree of commitment by the administration, processes and procedures used, and their overall feelings. Additional items that may be unique to the program can be incorporated in this survey.
- F. **Advisory committee perceptions:** The purpose of this survey is to obtain information from the members of the program advisory committee regarding the curriculum, outcomes, facilities, equipment, graduates, micro- and megatrends that might affect job placement (both positively and adversely), and other relevant information. Recommendations for improvement must be sought from this group. In the event that a

program does not have an advisory committee, a group of individuals may be identified to serve in that capacity on a temporary basis.

Section 3: Program Profile: *Include Administrative Program Review document in this section. Provide the number and percentage for the variable addressed for each of the years since inception (for new programs) or the last program review.*

A. PROFILE OF STUDENTS.

1) Student Demographic Profile.

- a) Gender, race/ethnicity, age (use annual institutional data).
- b) In-state and out-of-state.
- c) Full-time and part-time.
- d) Attend classes during the day, in the evenings, and on weekends.
- e) Enrolled in classes on- and off-campus.
- f) Enrolled in 100% on-line and/or mixed delivery courses.
- g) Discuss how the information presented in (a) through (f) impacts the curriculum, scheduling, and/or delivery methods in the program.

2) Quality of Students.

- a) What is the range and average GPA of all students currently enrolled in the program? ACT? Comment on this data.
- b) What are the range and average GPA's of students graduating from the program? ACT? Comment on this data.
- c) In addition to ACT and GPA, identify and evaluate measures that are used to assess the quality of students entering the program.
- d) Identify academic awards (e.g., scholarships or fellowships) students in the program have earned. Comment on the significance of these awards to the program and students.
- e) What scholarly/creative activities (e.g., symposium presentations, other presentations or awards) have students in the program participated in? Comment on the significance of these activities to the program and students.
- f) What are other accomplishments of students in the program? Comment on the significance of these accomplishments to the program and students.

3) Employability of students.

- a) How many graduates have become employed full-time in the field within one year of receiving their degree? Comment on this data.
- b) What is the average starting salary of graduates who become employed full-time in the field since inception (for new programs) or the last program review? Compare with regional and national trends.
- c) How many graduates have become employed as part-time or temporary workers in the field within one year of receiving their degree? Comment on this data.
- d) Describe the career assistance available to the students. What is student perception of career assistance?
- e) How many graduates continue to be employed in the field? Comment on this data.
- f) Describe and comment on the geographic distribution of employed graduates.

- g) How many students and/or graduates go on for additional educational training? (Give annual average.) Comment on this data.
- h) Where do most students and/or graduates obtain their additional educational training? Comment on this data.

B. ENROLLMENT.

- 1) What is the anticipated fall enrollment for the program?
- 2) Have enrollment and student credit hour production (SCH) increased or decreased since the last program review? Supply a table and comment on any enrollment trends.
- 3) Since the last program review, how many students apply to the program annually?
- 4) Of those who apply, how many and what percentage are admitted?
- 5) Of those who are admitted, how many and what percentage enroll?
- 6) What are the program's current enrollment goals, strategy, and efforts to maintain/increase/decrease the number of students in the program? Please explain.

C. PROGRAM CAPACITY

- 1) What is the appropriate program enrollment capacity, given the available faculty, physical resources, funding, accreditation requirements, state and federal regulations, and other factors? Which of these items limits program enrollment capacity? Please explain any difference between capacity and current enrollment.

D. RETENTION AND GRADUATION

- 1) Give the annual attrition rate (number and percent of students) in the program.
- 2) What are the program's current goals, strategy and efforts to retain students in the program?
- 3) Describe and assess trends in number of degrees awarded in the program.
- 4) How many students who enroll in the program graduate from it within the prescribed time? Comment on any trends.
- 5) On average, how long does it take a student to graduate from the program? Please comment.

E. ACCESS

- 1) Describe and assess the program's actions to make itself accessible to students. Use examples such as off-site courses, accelerated courses or other types of flexible learning, use of summer courses, multiple program entry points, e-learning, mixed delivery courses, scheduling.
- 2) Discuss what effects the actions described in (1) have had on the program. Use examples such as program visibility, market share, enrollment, faculty load, computer and other resources.
- 3) How do the actions described in (1) advance or hinder program goals and priorities?

F. CURRICULUM. The curriculum review section must also contain appropriate check sheets and example syllabi, which may be attached as an appendix.

- 1) Program requirements. Describe and assess the program-related courses required for graduation.
 - a) As part of the graduation requirements of the current program, list directed electives and directed General Education courses. Provide the rationale for these selections.
 - b) Indicate any hidden prerequisites (instances where, in order to take a program-required course, the student has to take an additional course. Do not include extra courses taken for remedial purposes).
- 2) Has the program been significantly revised since the last review, and if so, how?
- 3) Are there any curricular or program changes currently in the review process? If so, what are they?
- 4) Are there plans to revise the current program within the next three to five years? If so, what plans are envisioned and why?

G. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

- 1) Discuss student and alumni perceptions of the quality of instruction.
- 2) Discuss advisory committee and employer perceptions of the quality of instruction.
- 3) What departmental and individual efforts have been made to improve the learning environment, add and use appropriate technology, train and increase the number of undergraduate and graduate assistants, etc.?
- 4) Describe the types of professional development have faculty participated in, in efforts to enhance the learning environment (e.g. Writing Across the Curriculum; Center for Teaching and Learning, etc.) .
- 5) What efforts have been made to increase the interaction of students with faculty and peers? Include such items as developmental activities, seminars, workshops, guest lectures, special events, and student participation in the Honors Program Symposium.
- 6) Discuss the extent to which current research and practice regarding inclusive pedagogy and curriculum infuse teaching and learning in this program.
- 7) What effects have actions described in (5) and (6) had on the quality of teaching and learning in the program?

H. COMPOSITION AND QUALITY OF FACULTY. Describe and assess the composition of the faculty teaching courses in the program.

- 1) List the names of all tenured and tenure-track faculty by rank.
 - a) Identify their rank and qualifications.
 - b) Indicate the number of promotions or merit awards received by program faculty since the last program review.
 - c) Summarize the professional activities of program faculty since inception or the last program review (attendance at professional meetings, poster or platform presentations, responsibilities in professional organizations, etc.).
- 2) Workload
 - a) What is the normal, annualized teaching load in the program or department? Indicate the basis of what determines a “normal” load. On a semester-by-semester basis, how many faculty have accepted an overload assignment?
 - b) List the activities for which faculty receive release time.
- 3) Recruitment

- a) What is the normal recruiting process for new faculty?
 - b) What qualifications (academic and experiential) are typically required for new faculty?
 - c) What are the program's diversity goals for both gender and race/ethnicity in the faculty?
 - d) Describe and assess the efforts being made to attain goals in (c).
- 4) Orientation. Describe and assess the orientation process for new faculty.
- 5) Reward Structure: e.g., salary, professional development funds, travel funds, UCEL and FSUGR incentive money
- a) Describe the reward structure in the program/department/college as it relates to program faculty. Indicate the type of reward and eligibility criteria.
 - b) Does the existing salary structure have an impact on the program's ability to recruit and retain quality faculty?
 - c) Is the reward structure currently in place adequate to support faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service? If not, what recommendations would you make to correct the situation.
 - d) Is enhancing diversity and inclusion a component of the reward structure? Please explain.
- 6) Graduate Instruction (if applicable)
- a) List all faculty teaching graduate courses.
 - b) What percentage of graduate courses is taught by non-tenure-track faculty? Please comment.
 - c) What are the program's (or department's) criteria for graduate faculty?
 - d) Have all graduate faculty (including non-tenure-track faculty) met the criteria? Please comment.
- 7) Non-Tenure-Track and Adjunct Faculty.
- a) Please provide a list for the last academic year of full-time non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty who taught courses in the program. For full-time non-tenure track faculty, indicate the length of their appointments and the number of years of service at the University. Comment on the program's ability to retain non-tenure-track faculty.
 - b) What percentage of program courses is taught by the faculty in (a)? What courses are they teaching? Please comment.
 - c) Describe the required qualifications (academic and experiential) for faculty listed in (a). Indicate if all faculty have met the criteria, and if not, what is being done to resolve the situation?
 - d) Does the program consider the current use of non-tenure-track faculty to be appropriate? Why or why not?
 - e) If the program is accredited, what position if any does the accrediting body have regarding the use of non-tenured and adjunct faculty?
- I. SERVICE TO NON-MAJORS. *Describe and assess the impact that delivery of service courses offered by the program or the department has on the program.*
- a) Identify and describe the General Education service courses provided by the program faculty for other departments at FSU.

- b) Identify and describe any non-General Education service courses or courses required for other programs. Comment on your interaction with the departments or programs for which the courses are provided.
- c) Discuss the impact of the provision of General Education and non-General Education courses has on the program.
- d) Does the program plan to increase, decrease, or keep constant its level of service courses? Explain.

J. DEGREE PROGRAM COST AND PRODUCTIVITY DATA. *Submit Institutional Research and Testing data. Comment on the data.*

K. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION. *Describe and evaluate the program's assessment mechanisms.*

- 1) List and describe what variables are tracked and why when assessing the effectiveness of the program (e.g. mastery of essentials of subject area, graduation rates, employment rates, pass rates on professional exams).
- 2) Provide trend data for the variables listed in (1). Compare the data to accreditation benchmark standards if applicable, or provide some other type of assessment of the data.
- 3) Describe how the trend data in (2) is used to assess the rigor, breadth, and currency of the degree requirements and curriculum.
- 4) Describe how the trend data in (2) is used to assess the extent to which program goals are being met.

L. ADMINISTRATION EFFECTIVENESS

- 1) Discuss the adequacy of administrative and clerical support for the program.
- 2) Are the program and/or department run in an efficient manner? Please explain.
- 3) Are class and teaching schedules effectively and efficiently prepared? Please comment.
- 4) Are students able to take the courses they need in a timely manner? Please comment.

Section 4: Facilities and equipment

A. INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

- 1) Are current classrooms, labs, and technology (both on-campus and at off-site locations) adequate? Explain.
- 2) How does the condition of current facilities impact program delivery? Explain.
- 3) Describe the program's projected needs with respect to instructional facilities.
- 4) Describe current plans for facilities improvements and indicate their status.
- 5) Describe how proposed changes or improvements to facilities would enhance program delivery.

B. COMPUTER ACCESS AND AVAILABILITY

- 1) Outside of computers in faculty and staff offices, identify the computing resources (hardware and software) that are allocated to the program.
- 2) Discuss how these resources are used.
- 3) Discuss the adequacy of these resources and identify needed additional resources.

- 4) Does an acquisition plan to address these needs currently exist? Describe the plan. Has it been included in the department or college's planning documents?
- 5) Discuss the efficacy of online services (including WebCT) available to the program.
- 6) Discuss the adequacy of computer support, including the support for on-line instruction if applicable.

C. OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

- 1) Identify other types of instructional technology resources that are allocated or available to the program.
- 2) Discuss how these resources are used.
- 3) Discuss the adequacy of these resources and identify needed additional resources.
- 4) Does an acquisition plan to address these needs currently exist? Describe the plan. Has it been included in the department or college's planning documents?
- 5) Discuss the impact of adequacy of other types of instructional technology resources and support of these resources on the program.

D. LIBRARY RESOURCES

- 1) Discuss the adequacy of the print and electronic and other resources available through FLITE for the program.
- 2) Discuss the service and instruction availability provided by the Library faculty and staff with respect to the needs of the program.
- 3) Discuss the impact of the budget allocation provided by FLITE to your program. Is the budget allocation adequate? Explain.

Section 5: Conclusions based on data analysis derived from Sections 2-4 and on the collective wisdom and judgment of the PRP. In arriving at these conclusions, the PRP should summarize the relationship of the program to each of following specific categories and any other categories it deems appropriate:

A. RELATIONSHIP TO FSU MISSION

B. PROGRAM VISIBILITY AND DISTINCTIVENESS

C. PROGRAM VALUE

D. ENROLLMENT

E. CHARACTERISTICS, QUALITY AND EMPLOYABILITY OF STUDENTS

F. QUALITY OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

G. COMPOSITION AND QUALITY OF THE FACULTY

V. Appendix

A. Academic Program Review Calendar

Note: The Academic Program Review Calendar dates change annually. Users should access the current calendar on the APR website at the following URL:

<http://www.ferris.edu/htmls/administration/academicaffairs/vpoffice/senate/progreviewcounc/>

B. Sample Forms

1. **Program Evaluation Plan (sample document)**
2. **Yearly Administrative Review (current document)**
3. **Budget (sample document)**

PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN LEGAL ASSISTANT PROGRAM

Degrees Awarded: A.A.S. in Legal Assisting

Program Review Panel:

Chair and Program Coordinator: John Kane
Program faculty and Assistant Coordinator: John Vermeer
College of Business faculty: Michael Cooper
Individual with special interest in the Program: R. Dale Hobart
Faculty member outside the College of Business: Sally Krumins
Management Department Chair: Vivian Nazar

Purpose: To conduct a study of the Legal Assistant Program to evaluate its needs and effectiveness so the University can make informed decisions about resource allocations.

Data Collection Techniques

1. Graduate surveys completed in 1989 and 1994
2. Employer surveys from 1995
3. Student evaluation of program and courses from 1994 and 1995
4. Faculty perception of program from surveys to both Legal Assistant faculty and College of Business faculty.
5. Advisory Committee perceptions of the program from questionnaire to advisory board members.
6. Labor Market analysis information from current market indicators.
7. Evaluation of facilities and equipment by doing a review of the law collection in the library, the adequacy of classrooms and computer facilities.
8. Curriculum evaluation information will be taken from the American Bar Association self-study completed in 1995 and the ABA assessment of that information.

Schedule of Events

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Leader</u>	<u>Target Date</u>
Graduate Survey	Kane	November 15
Employer Survey	Kane	November 15
Student Evaluation	Vermeer	December 1

Academic Program Review: A Guide for Participants –June 13, 2005

Approved by the Academic Senate

Contact Person: Doug Haneline hanelind@ferris.edu

Faculty Perceptions of Program	Vermeer	December 1	
Advisory Committee Perceptions		Kane	December 1
Labor Market Analysis	Krumins	December 1	
Evaluation of Facilities	Krumins	December 1	
Curriculum Evaluation	Kane	December 1	

Yearly Administrative Review

Program _____

Purpose of Administrative Program Review

1. to facilitate a process led by the deans and department heads/chairs to assess and evaluate programs under their supervision
2. to facilitate long term planning and recommendations to the VPAA
3. to collect and analyze information that will be useful in the University's accreditation efforts; Academic Program Review deliberation; and assessment.

Instructions: Please prepare a report following the outline below.

I. Summary of Modifications since last report:

Please provide a brief summary of the changes that have taken place in the program since the last report.

II. Program Assessment/Assessment of Student Learning

- a) What are the program's learning outcomes?
- b) What assessment measures are used, both direct and indirect?
- c) What is the assessment cycle for the program?
- d) What assessment data were collected in the past year?
- e) How have assessment data been used for programmatic or curricular change?

Course Outcomes Assessment

- a) Do all multi-sectioned courses have common outcomes?
- b) If not, how do you plan to address discrepancies?
- c) How do individual course outcomes meet programmatic goals?

III Program Features

1. Advisory Board

- a) Does the program have a board/committee? When did it last meet? When were new members last appointed? What is the composition of the committee (how many alumni, workplace representatives, academic representatives, etc.)
- b) If no advisory board exists, please explain by what means faculty receive advice from employers and outside professionals to inform decisions within the program.
- c) Has feedback from the Advisory Board affected programmatic or curricular change?

2. Internships/Cooperative or Experiential Learning

- a) Is an internship required or recommended?

- b) If the internship is only recommended, what percentage of majors elect the internship option?
- c) What challenges does the program face in regard to internships? What is being done to address these concerns?
- d) Do you seek feedback from internship supervisors ?

If so, does that feedback affect pedagogical or curricular change?

3. On-Line Courses

- a) Please list the web-based courses, both partial internet and fully online, offered last year.
- b) What challenges and/or opportunities has web-based instruction created?
- c) What faculty development opportunities have been encouraged/required in order to enhance web-based learning within the program?
- d) How has student feed-back been used to enhance course delivery?
- e) Is there any plan to offer this program on-line? If yes, what rationale is there to offer this program online?" (emerging market opportunity?, expand enrollment?, demand for niche program offering?, etc.)

4. Accreditation

- a) Is the program accredited or certified?
- b) By whom?
- c) When is the next review?
- d) When is the self-study due?
- e) How has the most recent accreditation review affected the program?

5. Student/Faculty Recognition

- a) Have students within the program received any special recognition or achievement?
- b) Have faculty within the program received any special recognition or achievement?

6. Student Engagement

- a) Is volunteerism and student engagement a structured part of the program?
- b) Does the program utilize service learning in the curriculum?
- c) Does the program participate in the American Democracy Project?

IV. Academic Program Review Recommendations:

Please indicate the recommendations (enhancements or changes) made by APRC in the most recent review of the program by the APRC council. What actions have been taken in response to these recommendations?

Areas of Strength:

Areas of Concern (and proposed actions to address them)

Future Goals:

Other Recommendations:

Academic Program Review: A Guide for Participants –June 13, 2005

Approved by the Academic Senate

Contact Person: Doug Haneline hanelind@ferris.edu

Note: The YAR changes annually. Users should access the current YAR on the Assessment website at the following URL:

<http://www.ferris.edu/htmls/administration/academicaffairs/assessment/yearly-admin-review.htm>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doug Haneline, Chair, Academic Program Review Council

FROM: Bill Killian, Associate Professor,
Industrial Chemistry Technology Program
Dave Frank, Department Head, Physical Sciences

SUBJECT: Proposed budget for Industrial Chemistry Technology program review panel

DATE: October 30, 1995

Attached is the proposed budget for the Industrial Chemistry Technology review panel. Please contact us if you have any questions.

Student Surveys (375)

Copying Costs	\$ 28.13
Mailing Costs	206.25
Return Envelope Printing	25.50
Return Mailing Costs	146.25

Advisory Board Surveys

Copying and Mailing	7.00
---------------------	------

Student Wage Support

40 Hours at \$4.25/hour	170.00
-------------------------	--------

<i>Phone Expenses</i>	50.00
-----------------------	-------

<i>Final Document Copying Costs</i>	90.00
-------------------------------------	-------

TOTAL	\$ 723.13
--------------	------------------

C. Six-Year Academic Program Review Cycle

Academic Program Review: A Guide for Participants –June 13, 2005

Approved by the Academic Senate

Contact Person: Doug Haneline hanelind@ferris.edu

Note: The Academic Program Review Cycle is updated annually. Users should access the current cycle on the APR website at the following URL:

<http://www.ferris.edu/htmls/administration/academicaffairs/vpoffice/senate/progreviewcounc/>

Last Update: 8/4/06