Purpose

Graduate program review is an opportunity for programs without discipline specific accreditation or approval to engage in:

- Synthesis and evaluation of the degree to which the program meets intended operational and student learning outcomes;
- Strategic planning to guide continuous improvement of the program;
- Peer review to gather constructive feedback from the field regarding the quality of the program.

It is coordinated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness every 7 years for programs without periodic, discipline specific accreditation or approval. All programs that do not have periodic discipline specific accreditation or approval are required to participate. The process generally takes about 12 months to complete; however, the maximum amount of time allotted to complete the self-study is three semesters (not including summer). Appendix A includes a timeline for completing the self-study.

The department and program’s annual assessment and data reporting should be sufficient to identify the 3-year trend data needed to complete the self-study. Outcomes and conclusions of the 7-year program review are then reflected in subsequent annual assessment plans for programs, departments, and colleges/schools, as appropriate.

The Program Review process includes:

- A self-study of the program;
- A review of the self-study by a qualified external reviewer;
- A review and approval of the self-study by the Dean, AVP for Institutional Effectiveness, and the SVPAA/VPHS, as appropriate;
Contents of the Self-Study:

1) Title sheet indicating the program’s official name and CIP code

2) Signature page (see Appendix B)

3) Self-Study Summary
   - Summary of significant conclusions drawn from the program review process to include identification of the program's strengths, areas in need of improvement, and proposed goals and actions that will inform future program development. Summary may be presented in the form of a SWOT analysis to include strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Data/evidence, which should be detailed in the full document, must be used to justify conclusions.

4) Program Overview
   - Description of the program to include the mission statement, a brief history of the program, its role within the College/School and University, and how it supports the University’s mission and strategic plan.
   - A degree plan that lists all courses and the semester in which these courses are typically offered.
   - A curriculum map that reflects connections between student learning outcomes, assessment processes, and required courses.
   - Brief narrative statement addressing how the degree program and student learning outcomes are progressively more advanced than the baccalaureate degree.

5) Scholarly/Creative Productivity
   - To what extent are faculty and students engaged scholarly and creative activities that are appropriate and sufficient to support the program’s mission, goals, and learning outcomes.

6) Program Viability/Program Resources (see Appendix D for required data/evidence).
   - To what extent is student enrollment adequate and/or appropriate to support the program?
   - To what extent are faculty qualifications and numbers sufficient to support the program?
   - To what extent is the program utilizing technology to improve course/program delivery and/or enhance instruction?
   - To what extent are facilities, space, technology, and other resources sufficient to support the program (Data provided, in part, from USA facilities survey)?
   - Other important resource areas as identified by program faculty
7) Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Please consider data you have collected for each of the last three years on the program’s student learning outcomes individually and as a unit (see Appendix C for required data/evidence and additional questions to prompt faculty inquiry).
   - What can faculty conclude about the quality of student learning?
   - What can faculty conclude about the ability of their students to progress through and graduate from the program?
   - What can faculty conclude about the quality of their teaching?
   - What can faculty conclude about the preparedness of their graduates to enter the workforce and/or continue to their education?

8) Approval from Chair and/or Dean and Sr. VPAA indicating self-study is ready for external review (see Appendix B).

9) External reviewer report (TBD)

10) Required Appendices
   - Chair and program coordinator/director curriculum vitae
   - Course syllabi
   - Student/Program handbooks, if applicable
   - Required tables (see Appendices C and D)
   - Other data, evidence, or other supporting documentation as applicable or needed to justify conclusions about programs effectiveness.
Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Offices of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) and Institutional Research (IR) prepare program review materials and program specific data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August (last half)</td>
<td>Program coordinator and/or chair meets with (IE) to review the program review process and schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair and/or program coordinator meets with faculty and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair and/or program coordinator submits list of potential external reviewers to the Dean for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September (first half)</td>
<td>Dean submits list of approved reviewers back to chair and/or program coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September (last half)</td>
<td>Chair and/or program coordinator secures external reviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – March</td>
<td>Program staff and faculty prepare self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Program staff and faculty submit the self-study for an internal review and to the Dean, AVPIE, and Sr. VPAA for preliminary approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Chair and/or program coordinator sends the report to the external reviewer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Campus Visit</th>
<th>With Campus Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August (last half)</td>
<td>External reviewer’s report submitted to Dean; Review external reviewer’s comments with the dean, chair/program coordinator, and faculty.</td>
<td>Prepare for campus visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September (last business day)</td>
<td>Revise assessment plan, update results and develop actions based on findings of the self-study and the external reviewer’s recommendations. Report in TracDat.</td>
<td>External reviewer campus visit completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October (last business day)</td>
<td>Submit the final self-study to Dean, AVPIE, and Sr. VPAA for approval.</td>
<td>Revise assessment plan, update results and develop actions based on findings of the self-study and the external reviewer’s recommendations. Report in TracDat. Submit the final self-study to Dean, AVPIE, and Sr. VPAA for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November (last business day)</td>
<td>Send a copy of the approved Self-study to OIE</td>
<td>Send a copy of the approved Self-study to OIE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Campus Visit</th>
<th>With Campus Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December (last business day)</td>
<td>Upload report into TracDat as supporting documentation</td>
<td>Upload report into TracDat as supporting documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Self-Study Approval Signature Page

Department:
Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Department Chair

Dean

Assoc. VP for Institutional Effectiveness

Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

VP for Health Sciences
Appendix C

List of Required Data/Evidence for Student Learning Outcomes
Program Review of Graduate Programs

All required data/evidence is available either 1) through your annual TracDat reports or 2) from the Office of Institutional Research or Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Program faculty should feel free to include other data in addition to the required elements to support their decisions and/or conclusions in the self-study.

- Table 1: Program level aggregation of student mastery of student learning outcomes for the last three years

- Table 2: Program level aggregation of student retention (1 and 2 year) and completion rates (or time to degree). For the last three cohorts, as applicable.

- Table 3: Program level aggregation of student evaluations of teaching for the last three years.

- Table 4: Program level aggregation of post-graduation outcomes assessment for the last three years. This may be include one or more of the following (but not limited to) exit surveys, alumni surveys, employment rates, graduate school acceptance rates, etc.
Appendix C (cont.)

Questions to prompt inquiry about Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Please consider data you have collected for each of the last three years on the program’s student learning outcomes individually and as a unit.

- What can faculty conclude about the quality of student learning?
  - Questions to prompt inquiry: Is the standard for achievement set at an appropriate level? Is the standard understood and agreed upon by all faculty? Are there student learning outcomes where students perform particularly poorly or particularly well? Are there student learning outcomes where the standard for achievement should be raised or lowered? Where data are available, how do student compare to students in other USA programs or nationally?

- What can faculty conclude about the ability of their students to progress through and graduate from the program?
  - Questions to prompt inquiry: Do students exhibit difficulty progressing through the major at any point? If no, what are the things that faculty do that support student progression? If yes, at what points and/or why? Do students exhibit difficulty completing the program? If no, what are the things that faculty do that support student completion? If yes, at what points and/or why?

- What can faculty conclude about the quality of their teaching?
  - Questions to prompt inquiry: If there are areas of student learning identified as needing improvement (improving outcomes or raising standards), is modification/improvement of instruction identified as a possible means to improvement? Have there been efforts made to support and/or improve the quality of faculty instruction? Did program faculty implement any high impact practices and what was their effect, if any, on student learning outcomes, faculty or student engagement, etc. (see Appendix E for a non-exhaustive list of high impact practices)?

- What can faculty conclude about the preparedness of their graduates to enter the workforce and/or continued post-baccalaureate education?
  - Questions to prompt inquiry: Consider the program’s student learning outcomes and how they translate to knowledge, skills, and/or abilities that make your students attractive to potential employers and/or graduate school?
Appendix D

List of Required Data/Evidence for Program Evaluation
Program Review of Graduate Programs

- Table 1: Program level enrollment trends for the last five years.
- Table 2: List of identified peer programs (University, degree, and program name)
- Table 3: List of current program faculty, teaching load, courses most often taught, degrees, recent scholarly/creative activity (last three years)