



SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS

I. PURPOSE: Describe policy and procedures for academic program review.

II. REFERENCE

SUU Policy 13.29 Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment Committee
R 401 – 10.2.4 – Template for Three-year and Two-Year Follow-up
Reports
R 411 – Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews

III. POLICY:

- A. Background. The Utah State Board of Regents has delegated responsibility for three-year and two-year follow-up reports and cyclical academic program review to the Southern Utah University Board of Trustees. Program reviews will be conducted under the direction of the Provost's Office and submitted to the President and to the Board of Trustees, and the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education. A systematic program report and cyclical review process is a significant dimension of the University's assessment program.
- B. Purpose of Academic Program Reviews. The purpose of program review is to monitor and improve the quality of academic programs. The review provides information, analysis, and evaluation that will help the program and the University identify program strengths, whether program goals and objectives are being met, suggest areas for improvement, and make recommendations and commendations.
- C. Review. Program review begins with the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC):
1. The APRC will oversee the process of academic program reviews and three-year or two-year follow-up reports and will be comprised of the faculty senate president, the associate provost, and senior faculty members (one from each academic school or college and one representative of at-large faculty) appointed by the Provost.
 2. The APRC will meet each academic year to update and revise the schedule for Three-Year and Two-Year Follow-Up Reports and Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews. The timetable for reviews shall be maintained by the Associate Provost and will be reviewed by the APRC and the Deans' Council annually.



SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS

3. The focus of the committee will be to monitor and improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. In addition, reviews should include an evaluation of the need for and cost-effectiveness of the program and its alignment to institutional academic plans and the SUU Strategic Plan.
4. A copy of Three-Year and Two-year Follow-Up Reports and Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews shall be forwarded to the Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment Committee for review and comment.
5. The final report shall include recommendations to the Provost regarding the college/school and its academic programs, including human, physical, and financial resources.

D. Three-Year, Two-Year Follow-Up Reports

Three-year and two-year follow-up reports are mandated by the Board of Regents as per Policy R401. The review of any new academic programs is required three years after the program is established. The department chair/program director prepares the report following the template in the R401 policy and uses enrollment and other relevant data from the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment. The report also includes data regarding program graduates' employment or placement in graduate school. The report is forwarded to the APRC for review and comment and returned to the department/program if changes are deemed necessary. The final report is forwarded to the Provost's Office for submission to the SUU Board of Trustees for approval. The approved report is forwarded to the Board of Regents for further action as per R401.

E. Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews

1. Per Policy R411, Seven-Year Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews:
 - a. are faculty-driven with self-study involving faculty from the program being reviewed and with review being provided by peers from other programs
 - b. incorporate external review;
 - c. occur on a regular cycle;
 - d. are evaluative, not just descriptive;
 - e. are forward looking and focus on continuous improvement;
 - f. are concise, balanced and honest; and,
 - g. result in an action plan that will be implemented by the faculty.



SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS

2. Initial steps and notification:
 - a. each school or college of the University will be responsible for the completion of a self-study pursuant to the framework and criteria in Appendix A
 - b. in the month of May preceding the review which starts in September, the APRC notifies the dean of the selected program in writing to begin the formal process of program review using available data and information, catalogs and syllabi, and other materials in the college or school;
 - c. the Institutional Research & Assessment Office prepares activity reports and other data; and,
 - d. under the leadership of the dean, a faculty committee will be established as per paragraph E.2. below. The committee will,
 - review the criteria in Appendix A,
 - analyze available data and information sources, and
 - prepare a draft of the self-study document.(A self-study prepared for a specialized accreditation may satisfy this requirement. If using a self-study from an accreditation process, the document must be cross-referenced to the criteria set forth in *Policy 6.41, Appendix A*. If a self-study or an interim report is older than 5 years, then Appendix A must be used by the department or program.)

3. External review:
 - a. every self-study will receive an external review for additional perspective. Programs whose degree programs are accredited or seeking specialized accreditation may substitute the evaluation of the accrediting team for the external review. If an external review is older than 5 years, new external reviewers will be required as per 3.b. below;
 - b. at least two faculty members, one representing a USHE institution and a second representing a national perspective, will conduct the external review. The Provost, in consultation with the dean, will select the external reviewers. Each reviewer will receive a copy of the program's self-study and supporting documents and will be expected to spend at least two days on campus interviewing students, faculty and administrators and to prepare a report of findings and recommendations; and,



SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS

- c. copies of the reviewer's report will be sent to the program and to the APRC.
- F. Program Dean Responsibility.
1. The school or college dean will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the internal and the external review process for all programs in his/her school.
 2. The dean will establish a faculty committee to analyze and evaluate the self-study and comments of external reviewers. The faculty committee will have representation from the Faculty Senate. The committee will conduct and write the review.
 3. After reviewing all documents in the program review process, the dean may provide comments on all recommendations and add recommendations as needed. The comments will be sent directly to the program, Provost, and to the APRC to become part of the documentation of the review.
- G. Provost's Office Responsibility
1. Direct and monitor the process, and receive from the APRC the review materials and recommendations.
 2. Using the information gathered for the Cyclical Institutional Program Reviews and the Three-year and Two-year Follow-Up Reports, the Provost's Office creates summary reports as required for the State Board of Regents policies R401 and R411. The reports are forwarded, along with the Provost's recommendation, to the President and Board of Trustees, and the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education (OCHE).
 3. The Provost's Office will maintain the schedule of program reviews on its website.



SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS

Proposed Revised Appendix A – Academic Program Review Policy 6.41

The purpose of the table is to clarify and summarize the framework and requirements for academic program reviews.

SUU Program Review Assessment Framework: <i>Define, Facilitate, Assess and then Improve</i>				
Assessment Step	Purpose	Deliverables for Self-Study <small>Cover sheet, Tables of Contents, & Report: 28 to 50 pages</small>	Responsibilities	
			Provide information	Evaluate information
<u>Step I</u>	I.1. Articulate the program’s mission, student learning outcomes, and goals.	I.1.a. Describe the program’s mission, goals, and student learning outcomes and show how they connect to the University’s mission, goals, and student learning outcomes. (3 to 4 pages)	Program	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
	I.2. Provide an overview of the program.	I.2.a. Provide information about the program profile (e.g., demographics of students, faculty, and administrators) (4 to 8 pages)	Office of IR & Assessment	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
<u>Step II</u>	II.1. Provide a description of specific program resources and how they facilitate the achievement of goals and learning outcomes.	II.1.a. Overview of program resources (students, faculty, administrators, facilities, technology, equipment, and financial and organizational resources) (4 to 8 pages)	Program and Office of IR & Assessment	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
		II.1.b. Describe how achievement of the specific program goals and student learning outcomes is facilitated. (2 to 3 pages)	Program	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
<u>Step III</u>	III. 1. Describe how the achievement of program goals and student learning outcomes is monitored and to what degree they have been achieved.	III.1.a. Describe the structures and processes that the program has in place to monitor achievement of program goals and student learning outcomes on an ongoing basis and how key stakeholders (Faculty and others) are involved in those processes. (3 to 5 pages)	Program	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
		III.1.b. Evaluate the adequacy of the program’s resources and the program’s impact, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. (4 to 8 pages)	Program	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
		III.1.c. Describe how the specific program goals and student learning outcomes are assessed and provide evidence indicating the degree to which they have been achieved. (4 to 8 pages)	Program	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office
<u>Step IV</u>	IV.1. Describe use of assessment results for program improvement.	IV.1.a. Provide evidence of how assessment results were/will be used, as applicable, to improve achievement of program goals and student learning outcomes. (4 to 6 pages)	Program	Program, Dean, External reviewers, Provost Office

(Document preparation includes 1" margins, 12-point Arial Narrow)



SUBJECT: CYCLICAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS & REPORTS

Appendix B (Policy 6.41)

Data for Academic Program and Follow-Up Reviews

(Data for academic program reviews will be provided by the SUU Office of IR & Assessment)

I. Follow-Up Reviews (2 or 3 years)

1. R401 Board of Regents Policy 10.2.4 Template

A. Enrollment Data Required

Enrollment Data						
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
Students	Est.	Actual	Est.	Actual	Est.	Actual
FTE Enrollment						
Cost Per FTE						
Student/Faculty Ratio						
Headcount						
Tuition	Est.	Actual	Est.	Actual	Est.	Actual
Tuition to Program						

NOTE: SUU typically does not allocate tuition directly to academic programs

B Employment Information Required

Provide employment information on graduates of the program

II. Seven Year Cyclical Program Reviews Data Required (based on 3rd week reports)

1. Headcount (HC) and Full-Time Equivalence (FTE) of majors
2. FTE enrollments and SCH and ICH generated (FTE by major and non-majors)*
3. Degrees awarded
4. Class size (by Fresh/Soph, Jr/Snr, Graduate) and average class size by department & college
5. Student-faculty ratio
6. Student demographics (gender, ethnicity, class –e.g. Fresh/Soph/etc.)
7. Faculty characteristics (tenure status, rank, degrees, gender, ethnicity)
8. Budget – (Provost’s Office)
 - E&G budget
 - Auxiliary, Program Fees, or other revenue accounts
 - Grants
 - Fundraising

* In some cases non-budget related courses may be included in the data if specific programs include these offerings.