CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Academic Program Review Handbook

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
academicaffairs.cmich.edu
Last Updated Fall 2008

Contents

Preface

The purpose of this handbook is to provide understanding and guidance for all of those involved in academic program review. The process is comprehensive and multi-staged. The self-study is the foundation for all subsequent evaluation; self-studies that are evidence-based and result from substantive and collegial conversations among the faculty most directly involved will yield the most positive long-term outcomes, for it is those self studies that foster shared understandings and conceptions about the most desirable course for the future.

While the self-studies should use evidence collected over the past five to seven years, a consistent theme in the evaluation should be the future: What is next for this program? CMU's commitment to continuous improvement is integral to program review. Even with CMU's many strong programs—including the ones that are acknowledged as national leaders—it is assumed there is room for improvement or actions that must be taken to sustain high quality in the long run.

Credible self-studies will include discussions of weaknesses as well as strengths, threats as well as opportunities. Further, the program review process, combined with the assessment process, is intended to prompt ongoing collection and use of evidence relative to program quality—not to be a one year event.

It would be foolish to deny that program review is a time-consuming process. It does take substantial time and sustained effort. Each year we have been able to provide a bit more data from institutional databases. Our hope is that eventually programs will have access to these data on an ongoing basis, not just the year they are going through program review. We hope this handbook will make the expectations clearer and suggest some useful approaches to the program review process, including the self-study. Recently we have received some excellent self-studies and so are prepared to refer faculty new to this process to strong models. In Academic Affairs, we can also offer some support with the conduct of alumni surveys for programs undergoing review.

There is no way our efforts to provide institutional data, clearer instructions, etc., can eliminate the time the self-study requires. Program Review is the primary vehicle CMU uses to evaluate and sustain quality in our core mission: teaching and learning. It deserves our attention. If done well, program review can recognize quality and strengthen academic programs for the future. Through the shared understandings and aligned actions of the faculty and relevant administrators and support units, it can propel programs and CMU toward achievement of our top priority, creating teaching and learning environments of the highest quality.

Catherine Riordan
Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

Overview of the Program Review Process

1

The primary purpose of program review is to improve academic programs.[1] It is assumed that this will occur through the processes of:

- collecting evidence relative to quality
- shared reflection regarding a program's current status and future directions
- constructive feedback through peer and administrative review

Narratives, planning, and decisions emerging out of program review are important commentaries on the quality of academic programs that are not duplicated elsewhere. Thus, it is appropriate for program review to be used as one—often very important—piece of information about academic programs in the context of institutional planning and financial decision-making.

"The primary purpose of program review is to improve academic programs."

CMU's program review focuses on programs, not departments. The evaluation of the quality of a program depends heavily on an analysis of the extent to which the program is achieving its intended outcomes, particularly its goals for student learning. Therefore, evidence collected as part of the program's ongoing program-level assessment can and should be the foundation for the analyses called for in Chapter 2 of the self-study (see page 26 of this handbook).

The approach taken to the program review self-study reflects an interest in establishing clear aspirations regarding the components and processes of quality academic programs. These aspirations are phrased in the form of criteria which are affirmative statements of essential standards of quality. The criteria intentionally reflect ambitious--yet achievable--goals. In general, ambitious goals will beget higher quality and are yet another means of 'enhancing learning through shared expectations'--a cornerstone of the campus' raising academic standards initiative.[2] The underlying assumption is that if programs adopt these criteria as aspirations, direct attention toward them, and monitor progress on an ongoing basis, even if they cannot achieve them all, students, faculty and the institution will be well-served and the quality of academic programs enhanced.

Scheduling

Program review is a cyclical and ongoing process. Except for programs accredited by an outside organizations (see page 9), program reviews will be scheduled for each academic program every seven years. The program review schedule can be viewed on the Academic Affairs website.[3] Requests for alterations in the schedule should be made by the dean to the vice provost for Academic Affairs. Although programs will be reviewed individually, programs with a great deal of

1 Portions of this process, particularly the criteria to be addressed in the self-study, have been adapted from the Association of American Colleges' Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major (1992) and the Guidelines for Accreditation of the Higher Learning Commission (2003).

2 http://www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/standards/learning.pdf (currently under revision - ISPC, Priority Committee I)

3 http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/programreview/ProgramReviewSchedule2004-2011.pdf

overlap can be reviewed concurrently. When multiple programs are reviewed concurrently, for efficiency, there are components of the process that need only be done once (e.g., department audit, the first chapter of the self-study). It is important however, that information about curriculum, assessment, advising and planning for the future be distinct by program.

"Program review is a cyclical and ongoing process."

As a follow up to program review, the provost will ask for interim reports from the dean, the department or program leadership, and sometimes others, which summarize progress on actions deemed important to the program's future. Typically these are simple progress reports from (or through) the dean that can be provided via e-mail to the provost with a subject line "program review update (insert program name)."

Programs Needing Review

For the purposes of this policy, academic programs are defined as majors (including interdisciplinary majors), stand-alone minors, graduate programs, and protocols like those for Honors and Leadership. Concentrations within a major or graduate program should be reviewed together except in unusual circumstances. In some cases, degrees are defined as cohesive academic programs (e.g., B.S.B.A., B.S. in Ed) and will be considered programs for the purposes of program review. Majors and stand alone minors offered on those degrees also are subject to program review in line with these guidelines.

Programs that are offered only off-campus (e.g., Vehicle Design Major) will have their own program review cycle. Programs that are offered both on- and off-campus (e.g., M.S.A.) will be incorporated in the same self-study and other program review activities. The on-campus unit responsible for these programs is to assume the leadership for the program review, seeking information and guidance from ProfEd as needed.

Pre-professional programs (e.g., pre-law, pre-medicine) that are separate from a major are not ones for which program review is required. Instead, the provost's office and academic affairs is responsible for conducting regular evaluations of their effectiveness.[4]

Individual courses offered as part of the General Education Program or as a required sequence on a major or degree outside the department do not need to be reviewed as part of program review. However, some departments may choose to include such a review, particularly when these courses constitute a significant amount of the department's teaching activity. (See department-level criterion 4.) The General Education Program will be reviewed on a seven year cycle with the General Education Council leading the review and the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs assuming the role typically played by the dean.

4 See Preprofessional Adivsers Policy in University Policy Manual, July 2008

Special Types of Review

Most acadmic programs will participate in the full review process, but exceptions are made on a case-by-case basis. Two alternative processes exist: for programs that have recently gained specialized accreditation status, an abbreviated process is an alternative; for programs experiencing unusual circumstances, a modified program review process could be an option.

Abbreviated Process: Specialized Accreditation

Units that seek and maintain specialized accreditation with an organization that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors[5] will be allowed to engage in an abbreviated program review process. This abbreviated process will include:

- participation in the audit portion of the review (see Table 2 on page 12)
- submission of the self-study prepared for the specialized accrediting group
- submission of the letter from the body documenting accreditation or re-accreditation and any reports from the site visitors
- SWOT analyses carried out by both the program faculty and dean
- culminating interview with and feedback from provost

The timing of program reviews for these programs will be aligned with the accreditation cycles whenever possible. Any limitations on accreditation or re-accreditation may lead to a decision by the provost that the program must participate in the full CMU program review process.

Modified Process: Unusual Circumstances

In unusual circumstances, with the provost's prior approval, it is possible to modify the components of the process and criteria to which a program review responds. The nature of the modifications will be specified by the provost in consultation with the relevant dean and with consideration of the unique characteristics of the program under review.

The modified process may be appropriate when there are very few students enrolled in the program, making an analysis of student outcomes of limited value. Moreover, the question of whether it is possible to have a quality program that is very small, and whether it is a sound use of resources (human and financial) to do so must be addressed. If there are plans to grow or refresh the program, those would be outlined and commitments made as part of the program review self-study. If there are plans to merge the program with another or to eliminate the program, those too would be detailed. Sometimes an external reviewer is brought in to provide advice on possible directions; the decision to do so would be made by the dean in consultation with the program and/or department leadership.

5 See www.aspa-usa.org for list of ASPA members.

Program Review Components

The eight components of program review are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Overview of the Program Review Components		
Components	**Brief Overview**	**Examples of Evidence**
Department Audit	Departmental records and data, as well as institutional records (e.g., departmental data profile) examined for evidence related to criteria. Audit conducted by Academic Affairs staff.	Master course syllabi on file and updated; bylaws have been reviewed recently and include multiple measures of teaching effectiveness; current assessment plan.
Library and Information Technology Resources	Evaluations of adequacy of library and information technology resources.	Standard form completed jointly by program faculty and the library and technology staff.
Self-study	Program faculty create self-study in response to criteria. Dean vets the Self-study prior to it being sent for External Review.	Goals of department; CVs from Online Faculty Information System (OFIS); student learning and other student outcomes.
External Review	External reviewer selected by dean from list provided by department of academic leaders in same discipline, from similar or aspiration institutions.	Self-study; interviews with faculty; interviews with graduating seniors; review of portfolios.
Program-level SWOT Analysis, Next Steps and Ratings	Program summarizes its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, makes an overall summary ratings of quality and funding, and talks about Next Steps.	Audit, self-study, external review.
Dean-level SWOT Analysis, Next Steps and Ratings	Responsible dean reviews all above materials and responds with a SWOT analysis, ratings of quality and funding, and discussion of Next Steps.	Audit, self-study, SWOT, external review, ratings.
Provost Review and Recommendation	Materials sent by dean to provost; dean schedules a meeting. In conversation with program director (when applicable), department chair and dean (including graduate dean when applicable), provost comments on above materials, makes recommendations and group discusses plans for the future.	Audit, self-study, SWOT, external review, dean review.
Follow-up Actions	Individuals identified in memo from provost provide updates on progress.	Summaries of actions taken, reports, plans and curricular change requests.

Department Audit

As part of the program review process, an audit of departmental documents, processes, and webpages will be conducted by Academic Affairs staff. For departments with multiple programs that are not reviewed concurrently, the audit from the most recent review will be updated as needed. Requests for additional updates of the audit can be made by the program leadership, dean, or provost.

For interdisciplinary programs and protocols, it is recognized that not all aspects of the audit will be applicable. See Appendix A for a truncated list of criteria that can be applied to the audit of interdisciplinary programs.

The primary purpose of the audit is to periodically monitor that key documents are present and procedures are functioning effectively. It is a mechanism for assuring compliance with curricular policies of the Academic Senate as well as other university policies and expectations. This audit will be done within the year prior to the self-study, typically the summer before, by an Academic Affairs staff member. Before it is finalized, the report is reviewed with the department chair or program director, errors corrected, and then submitted to department or program, dean, and provost. This typically occurs prior to October in the year of the review. Items to be audited can be seen in Table 2.

"The primary purpose of the audit is to periodically monitor that key documents are present and procedures are functioning effectively."

Table 2: Criteria for the Department Audit
Department Leadership
1) The departmental mission statement is published in appropriate locations.
2) Key responsibilities for each academic program (e.g., advising, assessment and curricular currency) have been designated.
3) The department has a clear mission statement that is tied to the university and college missions, and has goals and objectives that are designed to assist it in achieving its mission.
4) The department regularly monitors progress toward achieving its mission, goals and objectives.
5) The department maintains accurate and accessible financial records.
6) The department employs faculty and staff whose gender/racial/ethnic diversity reflects that in the discipline and region.
Bylaws
7) The department maintains and regularly updates bylaws that govern its operations.
8) Departmental bylaws articulate clearly the governance and decision-making structures of the department.
9) Departmental bylaws include multiple measures documenting both the quality and quantity of: • teaching effectiveness • scholarly and creative activity • university and professional service
Academic Processes
10) Master course syllabi are on file for all courses and the bulletin class list matches the master course syllabi list.
11) Master course syllabi are updated at least once every five years.
12) Assessment plans for all programs are approved and up-to-date.
13) Annual reports are filed with the Assessment Council.
Other
14) Articulation agreements and similar means of facilitating the transfer of community college students exist for the largest undergraduate programs.
15) The department maintains records of students pursuing Plan A and Plan B.

The final score report sheet that is used in the audit appears in Appendix B.

Self-Study

The self-study is the heart of the program review process as it is the vehicle for focusing conversations among faculty and other stakeholders on evidence relevant to the current status of the program and the aspirations for its future. It calls for a wide-ranging analyses relative to many if not all the ingredients of a quality program. It does not however call for a detailed financial analysis as such analyses are ongoing and occur between the department chair or program director and the dean. Obviously the results of the financial status will influence the achievements discussed, but it is not the focus of the program review.

The self-study is most useful when it represents a serious process in which all or most program faculty are engaged at various points, helping to define the scope of the self-study and the nature of the evidence, collecting some of the evidence (e.g., from students in their courses), evaluating student work (e.g., reviewing sample of capstone projects), analyzing the implications of the evidence collected, and planning for the future based on the conclusions reached in the self-study. Hence the self-study process should be inclusive and evidence of that inclusivity documented in the self-study.

"The self-study process should be inclusive and evidence of that inclusivity documented in the self-study."

A division of labor within departments or programs has been key to the high quality self studies that reflect the conjoint involvement and endorsement of the program faculty. Clear expectations, frequent milestones for completion of work that span an academic year, discussions of evidence emerging in department and program meetings periodically during the year, and designated and effective leadership are keys to making this happen.

Use of Evidence Expected

It is intended that those faculty who prepare the self-study will take advantage of institutional reports and analyses. Toward that end, the program leadership will receive a program review data set from Academic Affairs near the end of September. Table 3 lists the data that are being supplied currently. The Online Faculty Information System (OFIS) will be used to provide some of the information on faculty activities; thus, is it critical that information be up-to-date. Faculty in departments or programs undergoing review will be asked by Academic Affairs staff to update their information in the Online Faculty Information System (OFIS) prior to the generation of these reports.

Table 3: Data Provided in the Data Set for Program Review

Source	Reports Provided
Institutional Research	• Enrollment by signed major • Grade distributions • Grades assigned • Distribution of 2nd and 3rd majors and/or minors at graduation • Delaware Study Data • Faculty Overloads • Graduating Student Exit Survey Data
Academic Affairs	• Individual faculty vita information (report presentations and performances of scholarly & creative work, publications, service) • Faculty Research Productivity measured by the Institutional Citation Report (ICR), a stand-alone database tool used to measure publication counts, citation counts, and citation impact for any regular faculty comprising a program • Books published according to Library for Annual Book Recognition Event
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs	• External grant and contract applications submitted by department • External awards received by department

The collection of some of the aforementioned data for interdisciplinary programs requires custom design. Directors of interdisciplinary programs should meet with Academic Affairs staff early in the process to identify information necessary to customize the reports.

"Claims should be substantiated by evidence and analysis presented in the self-study"

Addressing the Two Types of Criteria (Departmental and Program)

The self-study should be organized in the two chapters: Departmental Criteria (Chapter 1) and Program Criteria (Chapter 2). The first chapter will contain three criteria with evidence and analysis at the departmental level. For departments with multiple programs, this chapter is common to all programs. For subsequent reviews of other programs in the department that occur within five years of the first, self-study preparers are encouraged to revise and update this chapter from previous reviews. The second chapter hones in on the specific program being reviewed.

Narrative

The narratives in each of these sections should make claims about the department or program's standing relative to the aspiration stated in the criteria. Table 4 describes the two step process that should occur for each criterion: a summary of the evidence, followed by an analysis of the evidence. That claim should be substantiated by evidence and analysis presented in the self-study. Often this analysis leads to ideas for 'Next Steps' the department or program faculty will take to build on strengths or shore up weaknesses. It is very appropriate for these ideas to be included in the narrative and then again in the summary SWOT and Next Steps.

Table 4. Foundation for Narrative Criterion Statement	
1. Summary of Evidence	Faculty collaboratively determine and collect the evidence/documents that illustrate the extent to which the program satisfies the criterion. Results of the program's assessment of student learning will be central to many criteria. Data supplied by Academic Affairs and departmental records are also important.
2. Analysis of Evidence	A narrative statement interpreting and analyzing the evidence to the extent it informs program faculty of its current practices; provides information to improve the program, teaching effectiveness and student learning; and indications for the future.

The last section of the Handbook (page 20) includes a listing of all the criteria to be addressed, and descriptions of the types of evidence that could be included and examples of questions that could be used to focus conversations among faculty. For faculty not familiar with this type of narrative in which criteria are addressed with the provision and analysis of evidence, this chapter is meant to clarify how this is done. It is not meant to be all encompassing or prescriptive; rather the intent is to suggest directions and possibilities and to emphasize the expectation that the criteria and evidence are the starting point for analysis.

External Review

Each program or set of programs undergoing review will obtain feedback from one or more external reviewers. The external review works differently for accredited and non-accredited programs.

"External reviewers should be recognized leaders in the discipline."

For non-accredited programs, the selection of the external reviewer is one of the first actions that should be taken in the program review process, although the actual visit by the reviewer does not take place until after the completion of the self-study, which is sent to the reviewer along with all available appendices no later than two weeks prior to a campus visit. The external reviewer will be selected by the dean from a list of three or more qualified individuals provided by the department. A model reviewer contract is provided on the program review website and can be adapted to include additional stipulations the dean and department wish to include.[6]

Picking a knowledgeable and respected external reviewer who will provide candid,

6 http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/programreview/IndependentContractProgramReviewTemplate.pdf

helpful feedback is one of the best ways to strengthen the program review and promote constructive follow up actions. Reviewers should be recognized leaders in the discipline with recent experience in higher education institutions, preferably from CMU's benchmarking institutions--or if more appropriate--strong programs at other institutions.[7] Typically, individuals with CMU degrees, a real or potential conflict of interest, or who have close professional or personal relationships with CMU personnel or students are not appropriate external reviewers. A CV for the reviewer should be included as an appendix to the self-study.

The external reviewer will be sent a copy of the self-study and supporting materials after it has been vetted by the program faculty and dean. The reviewer will provide an in-depth review of the self-study, travel to campus to conduct interviews with program faculty, students, dean and other stakeholders, and then prepare a final report. The report should address the basic criteria of the self-study: program quality, processes supporting quality, size, resources and future opportunities for the program.

The dates of the visit and submission of the final report should be included in the contract developed by the dean. It is highly recommended that the reviewer be expected to submit a written report within two weeks of an on-campus visit and payment be made contingent on timely submission of a written evaluation which satisfactorily addresses the conditions laid out in the contract. The provost will cover the reasonable expenses and honoraria of an external reviewer up to $1,500. Typically, there will be just one reviewer. In some instances, given the complexity of the program (e.g., some interdisciplinary programs), or challenges facing the program (e.g., seeking major reorientation), more than one external reviewer may be used. Responsibilities for covering all costs should be assigned prior to the contract with the reviewer being signed.

Abbreviated Process: Specialized Accreditation

Programs which receive specialized accreditation, including a site visit, final letter(s) summarizing the review of the program and final decision, do not have to have a separate external reviewer. Rather the report of the visitors sent by the accreditation body and that body's final decision will constitute the external review. For the few programs for which accreditation is obtained without a site visit, those programs would typically invite an external reviewer according to the above procedure.

SWOT Analysis and Next Steps

Department or Program

At the conclusion of the self-study process, it is recommended that the program faculty draft a preliminary SWOT analysis to be included with the self-study (with appendices) mailed to the external reviewer. This analysis describes the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The preliminary

7 http://www.ires2.cmich.edu/comparative/peers_methodology.pdf

SWOT helps to direct the reviewer's attention to areas of particular interest to the program faculty.

After the visit and feedback from the external reviewer, a final program-level SWOT is prepared. It includes a Next Steps section which outlines ideas for maintaining strengths and correcting weaknesses, as well as strategies and action plans for responding to opportunities and threats. This analysis will be most useful when it is realistic, including the reality that resources for new initiatives will most often come from reallocations within the department or college.

"Resources for new initiatives will most often come from reallocations within the department or college."

The final section concludes with summary ratings, using the scale specified below (see Table 5), of the program's overall quality and its priority for additional resources or reduction in current resources. The SWOT analysis and Next Steps are included with the self-study (with all appendices) and then transmitted to the dean.

Table 5. Summary Ratings of Quality and Funding

First Dimension: Program Quality	
1 = Exceptional Quality	Program quality is truly exceptional, constituting one of the top programs among comparator programs nationally
2 = High Quality	Program is of high quality and needs few if any improvements
2.5 = Moderately High Quality	Program is of moderately high quality, but needs improvement in a few areas
3 = Needs Improvement	Program is a solid program, but needs significant improvement in many areas
4 = Low Quality Program	Program is of marginal or low quality
Second Dimension: Changes in Funding	
1 = Top Priority	Program needs additional resources and should be a priority for new resources or reallocation of existing resources
2 = Secondary Priority	Program needs additional resources and should be a priority for new resources or reallocation after addressing top priority programs a. University-level reallocation b. Provost-level reallocation c. College-level reallocation
3 = No Increase	Program does not need additional resources beyond those that are available at the department level or through department actions
4 = Reduction	Program resources should be reduced and reallocated to higher priority programs

Dean or Deans

The responsible dean (and graduate dean in the case of graduate programs) will review the department audit, self-study, report of the external reviewer, SWOT analysis and the program's overall quality and funding ratings. The dean (or deans working independently or together) will then provide a response in the form of a SWOT analysis and Next Steps, along with his or her own ratings of quality and funding needs to the program's leader and/or department chair. Some colleges will have a conversation between the college dean and program leadership at this point, but this is not required. These conversations may result in modifications of the SWOT and Next Steps before the documents are sent to the provost.

Submit two copies of the final versions of all of these documents (see list in Table 6) to the provost along with a request for a final interview. For graduate programs, a third copy shall be provided to the dean, college of graduate studies.The dean will clarify whether the dean's office or the department or program leadership will submit the package to the provost's office and will confirm the provost's receipt of the document.

Table 6. Complete Self-study Outline

No.	Section Title
1	Table of Contents
2	Self-study a. Departmental Criteria b. Program Criteria
3	Department Audit Report
4	Library and Information Technology Forms
5	External Reviewer Report and External Reviewers CV
6	Departmental SWOT and Next Steps Document
7	Dean SWOT and Next Steps Document
8	Program Review Data Reports from Academic Affairs

Culminating Conversation with Provost

After the documents have been forwarded to the provost, the college should work with the provost's office (774-7162) to schedule a meeting of the provost and vice provost, dean and graduate dean for graduate programs, department chair, program leaders (e.g., area coordinator, graduate coordinator). For interdisciplinary programs those in attendance should include the program coordinator or director, program faculty, and the relevant college dean and graduate dean, if appropriate.

In the meeting a brief presentation of 10 minutes will be made by a program faculty member, coordinator, or department chair. The presentation should include a very brief summary of the overall conclusions reached as a result of a synthesis of conclusions in audit, self-study, external review, SWOT and summary ratings, followed by a longer focus on the Next Steps and future plans for the program. How will the unit build on success? How will it improve on shortcomings? What if any new directions are going to be pursued? What is needed to accomplish all this? That brief presentation will be followed by questions and answers for up to 45 minutes.

Provost's Feedback and Follow Up

The provost's letter will include a summary rating of quality and quantity as well as a set of recommended actions to be taken by various individuals in response to the program review. Table 7 lists some examples of the kinds of actions that have been requested recently. Note most actions come with a deadline prior to which an update, final report or action should be taken. Other more frequent updates are welcomed from the dean or the program leadership (through the dean) in a letter or email to the provost with a copy to the vice provost.

As program faculty, and departmental and college leadership take actions in response to program review, or new related opportunities or challenges emerge, faculty or deans should feel free to propose alternative actions to those called for by the provost if in their judgment those would be in the best in interests of the program's students and faculty and CMU. All such proposals, if not initiated by the college dean, should be reviewed and endorsed by the college dean prior to being forwarded to the provost.

Table 7. Examples of Recommended Actions from the Provost
• Provide a brief report on plans for faculty professional development. • Develop a faculty recruiting plan that includes clear goals and means of evaluating the effectiveness of the various recruiting efforts. • Revise assessment plan as appropriate and identify additional assessment efforts that provide direct evidence of student learning. • Develop plan for hiring and promoting the success of new tenure track faculty members • Update master course syllabi that have not been updated in last five years • Prepare and submit brief report on new strategies and plans to assure external funding. • Develop and submit an enrollment management plan. • Continue work on improving website to include up-to-date information about program for students, prospective and current. • Develop a plan for strategic scholarship support based on market analysis and available resources. • Update bylaws • Submit report of the program faculty's ideas for recruiting and retaining new faculty members and plans for the future.

2 Criteria to be Addressed in the Self-Study

T

To facilitate a comprehensive and useful self-study, a common set of criteria should be addressed. The CMU criteria are derived from understandings of quality programs. They are intentionally broad, allowing preparers of self-studies to include the most relevant information and tailor a focus most appropriate to the program under review. All criteria are not equally important contributors to quality for all programs. Nevertheless the self-study should address each of the criteria, except when a criterion is clearly irrelevant (e.g., thesis supervision in an undergraduate program).

"The self-study should address each of the criteria..."

To address each criterion, to the extent possible, relevant evidence should be accumulated, reviewed and its implications analyzed in conversations among the faculty involved in teaching within the program. In the written self-study narrative, a summary of the evidence or a reference to evidence in the appendix or on the web is expected so that readers also may develop their own conclusions based on the evidence. The data typically need not be included in the self-study narrative; summaries (e.g., tables) are appropriate. Similarly, not all stages of the analysis need be summarized—final conclusions and evidence-based explanations are appropriate. Thus, for some criteria, the narrative may just be a paragraph or two and a table. For others, which are important and for which there is a good deal of evidence and analysis, the narrative may be a few pages. Cross references to other sections in which an issue is fully addressed are appropriate. Addressing two or more criteria with one narrative may also appropriate at times and when clearly noted.

CMU's approach to program review, which uses criteria to organize a self-study, and calls for evidence in support of claims made, is one common to higher education accreditation. The criteria are stated as ideals, with the understanding that they are aspirational and that few if any programs would be able to document full realization of the criteria. On the other hand, it is expected that programs will be able to document they are looking at evidence that allows them to evaluate the quality of the program relative to the criteria and, further, that they are engaged in actions to keep the program current and to improve areas where performance does not meet expectations (i.e, continuous improvement).

"The criteria are stated as ideals, with the understanding that they are aspirational..."

The self-study should be organized into the sections defined on the following pages. Relevant supplemental sections or information may be inserted in appropriate places, but all appropriate criteria must be addressed, preferably in the order in which they appear below. The first chapter, with its three sections, addresses issues at the departmental level. These sections can be common to all programs in a particular department, meaning that multiple programs within a department may use the same narrative. Programs undergoing reviews in subsequent years are encouraged to update rather than rewrite this chapter. There may be cases in which self-study preparers may wish to further break out department into program level evidence and conduct the analysis at that level. This too would be appropriate.

Self-Study Chapter One: Department Level Criteria

The first three sections of the self-study narrative should address the department's

A) mission and integrity
B) research and other creative activities
C) engagement and service

There are specific criteria that need to be addressed in each section (identified by numbers beneath each section). In addressing the criteria we recommend the following sequence in response to each criterion.

1. What is the evidence? (Summary of Evidence)
2. What are the conclusions reached on the basis of that evidence? (Analysis of Evidence)
3. Should any actions be taken? (Next Steps)

A. Mission and Integrity

1. The department uses its mission, goals, and objectives as a basis for decision-making, including decisions about programs, enrollment, faculty and staff recruitment, and allocation of resources.

"The department uses its mission, goals, and objectives as a basis for decision-making..."

A review of the department's mission is appropriate here, followed by an analysis of the extent to which the mission is clear and still appropriate given the faculty's thinking about the future. The primary focus is the extent to which decisions are being made that support the mission.

Discussing how course scheduling and recruiting of new faculty have or will allow the department to better achieve its mission are examples of issues that could be addressed. Others include how the department is choosing to distribute resources among its programs based on the department's overall mission.

2. The department's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the department to fulfill its mission. There is an open and effective allocation of departmental resources.

This criterion speaks to how well the department functions. Do members assume responsibility for tasks that must be accomplished? Are those tasks done well and on time? Do the bylaws help to promote the goals of the department? Are the responsibilities of the chair defined and reasonable?

3. The department possesses adequate resources to support its mission and goals and the size and scope of its programs.

Resources here includes positions, faculty and staff expertise, space, equipment, and S&E. If comparison data are available (e.g., Delaware Study) they could be used as the starting point for analysis here. Deans' offices may be helpful with more detailed financial data.

As a context, you should know few CMU departments and programs are funded above the Delaware study averages. Like the university as a whole,[8] CMU departments and programs, with very few exceptions, must operate with limited resources, with limited expectations for 'new money.' Moreover, CMU's academic budgets are decentralized with resources coming largely from tuition revenue distributed to the college and then to departments. Consequently, discussions of this criterion will be most fruitful if the focus on how these scarce resources are being allocated to support the strategic directions of the department. Are resources distributed across the department's programs in appropriate ways or are changes needed? Have there been reallocations in order to better support the mission and goals or shifting student enrollments? Are there ways resources could be better used in the future? Is external support for the department from grants, contracts and private fund raising what it should be? If not, what improvements could be made?

"The department rewards, promotes and achieves excellent teaching."

4. The department rewards, promotes and achieves excellent teaching. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is carried out using multiple measures of teaching effectiveness.

Critical to strong academic programs is strong teaching. How strong is the instruction in the department? Answers to this basic question can be found in student opinions, including data from the SOSII, alumni surveys and teaching awards. Evidence of student achievement of learning outcomes is particularly compelling evidence of good teaching.

Critical conversations in many departments extend to analyses of variability in the quality of teaching and what the department is doing about poor teaching. How effective have the department's efforts to improve teaching been? Do the bylaws reinforce the value of good teaching? Areas needing improvement could be identified, along with plans for how those improvements will be made.

5. The department effectively recruits and orients new faculty members and supports the professional development of faculty at all levels.

New faculty members who are successful are critical to the long term success of departments. The first analysis here could be of the number of new faculty over the last seven years and an analysis of their 'success.' Evidence relative to their participation in orientations by department, college and

8 Institutional Self-Study Report for Central Michigan University (2005) submitted to the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. http://www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/secured/Book-SelfStudy2005.pdf (page 87, Figure 4.7 Student-to-Faculty Ratios at Benchmark Institutions; Figure 4.8 Student FYE S-to-Staff FTE Ratios at Benchmark Institutions)

university could be shared. Do new faculty believe there faculty are prepared appropriately? Is there evidence of continuing faculty receiving updates or reminders? Mentoring programs could be described along with participation and relationship to faculty success. Similar participation and outcome evidence could be shared for continuing faculty. Discipline-based professional development workshops or internships, as well as specialized training such as that for chairs or assessment coordinators, would be worthwhile to highlight as evidence relative to this criterion. For most departments giving specific procedural and policy information to new faculty can be critical to their roles as instructors, faculty advisers, researchers, grant writers, grant managers, supervisors of student teachers, internship supervisors, etc. Is this happening and new faculty are taking advantage of this?

Based on the above evidence, the department will want to evaluate whether the degree of success of new and continuing faculty suggests that the current means of orientating and providing access to mentors and faculty development are adequate. If so, are there strategies that could be shared as examples of best practices with other units? If not, what needs to happen? What evaluations or initiatives might improve the current situation or are needed to address changes in the students, faculty, programs, pedagogy in the discipline, etc.

"Is the level of scholarship appropriate given the field and the needs of the program or related programs?"

B. Research and Other Creative Activities

1. Faculty are engaged in quality discipline-based scholarship or other creative activities.

The program review data set contains a listing of faculty scholarly activity as well as comparisons with other institutions in the Delaware Study. When appropriate, a report based on evidence from the Institutional Citation Report (ICR) is part of the program review data set, including publications, citations and comparison with benchmarks. This evidence should be useful in evaluating the quality and quantity of the scholarship within these disciplines in a national context. Some professional associations also do their own studies and these statistics could be used for comparison activities.

Analysis of the available evidence with respect to faculty research and creative activity could include the overall level of activity. Is the level of scholarship appropriate given the field and the needs of the programs or related programs? Is the variability among faculty scholarship appropriate given the department's mission and plans for the future? Are faculty publishing in the core journals of the field or are there gaps?

2. Students conduct research or participate in other creative activities with faculty.

CMU places a high value on the engagement of undergraduate and graduate students in scholarly activities with faculty. The program review data set will contain lists of faculty-student research presentations and publications, as well as faculty-supervised student research. This evidence should be supplemented by the department with awards or other evidence of quality in students' research or other creative activity.

The analysis here could begin with a review of the number of projects completed and underway, how many have resulted in presentations or publications, their distribution across the department's program areas, levels and faculty, and any awards received. Is this level of activity satisfactory? Do the scholarly products make it to national peer reviewed venues? The various means a department is supporting these activities should be evaluated. What is working? What is not? Are faculty who contribute to these activities being recognized appropriately? For graduate programs, are students publishing with faculty? Are the faculty effective mentors to students in the publication process?

3. External public and/or private funding for academic programs, research or other creative activities, and/or service activities are actively pursued by faculty members.

Each department should be engaged in some attempts to raise external funding. For some departments, this will be necessary for the conduct of research. For others, it is not necessary, but is highly desirable to support a departmental activity. Many programs have opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, even when they do not have external funding options for their discipline. Moreover, within a department, the opportunities for funding or talent for fundraising will vary across faculty members. The department's expectations or how the department assigns responsibilities to specific faculty would be a good thing to discuss and then describe in the self-study. The program review data set includes a report of grant and contract funding. There may also be private fundraising activities and outcomes that could be summarized here based on evidence supplied by the deans' offices. There is comparison information in the Delaware Study and for some in the Institutional Citation Report (ICR). Disciplines may also publish information that can be used as a context for the funding levels achieved by the CMU department.

The analysis here could include the overall level of funding that has been achieved. Is it satisfactory? Has the funding received been used in ways that have promoted the department's mission and programs? Are there needs and/or opportunities for funding that have not been realized? What would it take to achieve those? Are new faculty being adequately introduced to CMU's support for research and creative activities? Is that support adequate? Are faculty taking advantage of interdisciplinary collaboration?

C. Engagement and Service

1. The faculty contribute valuable service to the department, college, university, community and profession. That level of service is appropriately balanced with other departmental priorities and across departmental members.

There is a summary of faculty service derived from the Online Faculty Information System (OFIS) in the program review data set. It will include both local as well as national service, reported for individual faculty members. The department may wish to create summary tables as the basis for an evaluation of the balance between university and professional service, and comparison among faculty and comprehensiveness of the service in key strategic areas. Departments are encouraged to supplement these data with evidence about quality of service from national or university awards for example.

Program review is a good time to evaluate whether the level of service is appropriately balanced with other departmental priorities and across the faculty as a whole and specific groups (e.g., individuals from underrepresented groups; new faculty). Also, do the departmental bylaws support appropriate levels of service? Is there any acknowledgement of the quality or quantity of service? Are the current service activities leading to the achievement of the department's mission or are they distracting from that?

2. The department identifies the internal and external constituencies it serves, learns from them, and can demonstrate that it serves them in ways both value.

CMU 2010's fourth priority is, "Providing service for the public good." Integral to achieving this priority is the understanding of CMU's constituencies, i.e., those groups served within CMU's core mission. Internal constituencies for many departments involve student majors, minors, and graduate students as well as students in the departments' general education courses and courses required for other majors, or even faculty in other departments who share laboratory space or collaborate in research. External constituencies include the employers of CMU interns, student teachers or graduates, many regional organizations as well as Michigan citizens.

The actions of academic departments are integral to CMU's ability to achieve this priority. Many departments have strong traditions and more recent innovative programs, often designed to serve two core constituencies, CMU students and an external group. The student teaching partnerships between K-12 schools and CMU's professional education would be a prototypical example that partnerships satisfy needs of both groups. There is the expectation a department understands its constituencies, thus, the narrative in this section should describe who those constituencies, the interests of both groups. Each department will be different and therefore will adapt answers to this question to reflect its own key constituencies.

The analysis here could focus here for example on the level of external engagement, is it appropriate, or too little or too much? Are the right partners involved? Are the needs of both the partner and the department being met in a satisfactory manner? What could be done to make this into an even better relationship in the future?

Optional Elaboration on Contributions to Other Programs

All departments do have stakeholders outside of the students and faculty in their own programs. However, there are departments for which service to other programs is such a significant proportion of the mission that the department may wish to elaborate on those contributions in the self-study. The general education program, required courses for other majors or degrees, interdisciplinary programs, and concentrations on majors or degrees are typical examples. At a minimum, the following criteria should be addressed.

1. Faculty members are aware of the goals of the program(s) they serve. They understand and have evidence relative to how their courses contribute to achieving those goals.

2. Master course syllabi for these courses for other majors are up to date and consistent with the goals and objectives of the relevant program(s).

3. Evaluation methods for all courses and sections reflect the course objectives and are consistent with policies and other programs being served.

> For example, when the department's contributions are to general education, documentation of what faculty are learning in the assessment of student learning relative to the goals and objectives of the subgroup(s) in which the department's courses are listed could be discussed.

Self-Study Chapter Two: Program Level Criteria

The second chapter focuses directly on the program being reviewed. The sections are

A) curriculum
B) teaching
C) student support & advising
D) overall quality
E) preparing for the future

A. Curriculum

A well designed curriculum is a set of interrelated courses and experiences leading to the development of the desired learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and values). Courses and out-of-course experiences are planned and developed in harmony with each other in order to enhance student learning and provide students with the opportunities to synthesize, practice and develop increasingly complex ideas, skills, and values. Program-level assessment provides the opportunity to assess student learning beyond individual courses. It allows faculty and students to make connections among courses in the program and with other fields of study. Program-level assessment should provide evidence of the kinds of work students are attempting and whether they are able to synthesize and integrate knowledge from different courses with the program. Faculty members must accept responsibility for the program's intended outcomes and curriculum; a responsibility shared by all who teach in the program and who influence the curriculum and the selection of instructors.

1. Across the program's courses and assessments there is evidence that all or most students are achieving each of the program's learning outcomes.

The Assessment Council has developed a cycle for program assessment that is synchronized with program review, designed to provide the maximum amount of evidence about student learning outcomes at the time of the review. Program faculty are encouraged to review and discuss all the evidence gathered over the past seven years.[9] Most of this will be in departmental records, although there are plans to provide graduating senior and alumni survey results to programs when the number of respondents in greater than five. Also, the report of grading patterns included in the program review data set should also be reviewed here as evidence of student achievement.

The analysis should focus primarily on student achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Are the aspirations of the faculty for students' learning actually being realized? For this reason, this criterion may be the most important one, and one which is addressed by the program faculty as a whole, probably at multiple meetings over the course of the year. Questions program faculty will want to address include the overall level of performance of students, as well as the variability among students' levels of achievement. Are there students who are graduating after having achieved all or none of the outcomes at satisfactory levels? Is student performance in particular areas particularly strong or weak? How does this map onto the required courses? Do the grading patterns correlate with the evidence from assessment or is there a disconnect between students' grades in the program and their achievement of the program outcomes?

These discussions may also lead to a desire to refine the program's learning outcomes or assessment strategies. Immediately after program review, within two years, the Assessment Council asks the program faculty to carry out an updating of their assessment plans. Support in rethinking assessment is always available from the Office of Curriculum and Assessment and the colleges' representatives to the Assessment Council.

In addition to offering this support, the Assessment Council offers a number of tips surrounding assessment. Keep the assessment effort simple enough that it can be sustained. Use multiple measures as each measure will have limitations. Assess outcomes at the end as well as earlier within the program. Be sure there is enough direct evidence of student learning outcomes that faculty can feel confident in their judgments of quality.

9 http://academicsenate.cmich.edu/Policy/Student%20Learning%20Outcomes%20Assessment%20Policy%20appd%202-28-7.doc

2. There is a common core of courses taken by all students in the program and a prescribed sequence that students follow and through which student learning outcomes are introduced, emphasized and reinforced in the core courses.

A careful review of the curriculum, assessment plan, and students' actual course taking patterns will be the most fruitful place to start with this analysis. The course numbers, course prerequisites, and the curriculum map which is part of the Assessment Plan are all excellent pieces of evidence to review. Looking at the grades, particularly the D-F-W rates for core courses can be helpful in understanding where changes in prerequisites, pedagogy or curriculum may be needed. Program faculty may also wish to review all teaching syllabi for added or omitted material. A blind review of randomly selected transcripts of recent graduates can be very helpful. These can be obtained by contacting Academic Affairs. In the program review data set are statistics for how long it takes program graduates to complete their degrees. For disciplines in which there is national debate on the curriculum, comparison of CMU's program to curricula or outcomes being recommended by professional organizations would be very informative.

The analysis of the above forms of evidence can be fostered by questions like: Are the learning objectives still appropriate given what is happening in the field today? Are all of the courses in this program still relevant and needed? Should courses be combined so new ones could be formed? Given the results of assessment, is the type and sequence of courses achieving the intended student learning? Looking at how students proceed through the curriculum, would any changes in scheduling, prerequisites or numbering promote greater learning? For students who take longer than four or five years, is corrective action in advising, degree maps, course scheduling, pedagogy, content, or perquisites suggested?

3. There is at least one experience toward the end of the program in which students synthesize their learning. Evidence gathered from students suggests they are achieving the desired integration and application of learning by the time they complete the program.

Supervised culminating or capstone-type experiences, whether courses, seminars, student teaching or internships, are seen as powerful learning experiences and highly valued by the employers of college graduates. Beyond a review of the syllabi for this experience, program faculty are advised to consider reviewing examples of student work in the capstone (e.g., a random set of students' final papers or the work of students who received the five highest and lowest grades the previous year). Much of this evidence is available at the department level, but careful planning and coordination is often needed to be sure that examples of student work are collected in the key courses, possibly over a period of time and from multiple instructors. Looking at samples of student work, rather than all work or all students, is a pragmatic approach often adequate for a basic monitoring of program quality. Some programs, particularly pre-professional programs, also receive information from employers or licensing exams which can be included as evidence in this section.

The analysis relative to this criterion of quality should involve both the intentions as reflected in the formal curriculum (master course syllabi and program objectives) as well as the success as revealed in student work. Questions for discussion could include, does the capstone represent a synthesis in all important areas of the program? Does the pedagogy being used reflect up to date understanding for how best to encourage higher order reasoning among students?[10] Are students adequately able to synthesize and apply learning across all areas of the program? Are there any areas in which all students or some students consistently fall sort of expectations?

B. Teaching

1. Faculty members pay attention in their courses to links among courses and the overall goals of the program and, for undergraduate programs, to overall goals of general education.

A careful review of master course syllabi, teaching syllabi, assessment evidence and possibly even SOS II averages for classes can provide solid evidence surrounding this important aspect of learning. Studies of learning show the importance of reinforcing initial learning as well as systematic expansion of that learning.

Using the above documents, discussions surrounding the linkages among courses and between the program and general education and competencies at the undergraduate level can reveal where learning is best supported and where there are opportunities for improvement. CMU undergraduates report they are asked to do a lot of memorization, rather than higher order thinking, which is the opposite of which CMU faculty intend to do.[11] Are students in the program being asked to do too much memorization? Is there consistency of requirements across faculty?

The higher education community is touting the value of a liberal arts education. Is that happening in the program? Are students helped to see their majors in a broader context and relevance of their major field to the greater society and intellectual history? Are all faculty teaching undergraduates familiar enough with the purposes of CMU's general education program to be able to build on gen ed in the program? Is the integration up to individual instructors or do the program faculty as a group have a plan to make direct linkages in their courses to specific general education outcomes? Do the program faculty discuss these issues enough or should more regular discussions be scheduled?

10 CMU students report that they are asked to less higher order reasoning and analysis than students are peer institutions (NSSE 2005-2008).

11 NSSE results

2. Faculty in the program utilize a variety of teaching techniques and are aware of research in teaching and learning. Evidence suggests these pedagogies are contributing to student learning in intended ways.

Effective teaching optimizes learning opportunities for students and is informed by current scholarship of teaching and learning. Use of a variety of teaching techniques will increase the likelihood that all learning styles are engaged.[12] The teaching syllabi may be the best source of evidence with respect to the pedagogical strategies being used. Review of the assignments and exams in required courses is an even more comprehensive way to understand the pedagogies being used. Student performance on those assignments is a powerful demonstration of what they know, and potentially of how well they are integrating their knowledge throughout the program, as well as progressing toward the desired program learning outcomes. Looking at student success in the courses in the form of grades, attrition or time to graduation will also provide evidence with respect to the effectiveness of teaching (as well as many other things). Some programs go so far as to provide structured peer reviews which can be reviewed as a group for the overall effectiveness of teaching within the program.

For some programs, the collection and sharing of this information about pedagogies has been done for the first time in the context of program review. Conversations could focus on the best examples of inclusive or integrative assignments being used, or ways assignments across courses could be better integrated to assure students have the opportunity to reach higher levels of learning and reasoning in a particular area. Looking at student performance in their senior year, could suggest the need for different pedagogies in earlier courses. How are faculty staying up on the scholarship of teaching and learning? Are they attending CMU and discipline teaching workshops? Do departmental seminars ever discuss teaching? Do all faculty use Blackboard? Are there other CMU-supported technologies that would further support learning?

3. Faculty provide effective and timely feedback and direction to students, including homework, tests, theses, dissertations and Plan B papers.

Often self report and aggregates of student reports on the SOS are the best sources of evidence with respect to effectiveness and timeliness of feedback. More indirect, but potentially relevant, measures of timeliness come from the time it takes doctoral students to finish, or feedback on timeliness from alumni. Some programs conduct exit interviews and the issue of feedback could be included. Effective feedback could be inferred from students being able to publish their research, receive scholarships or win national awards. For graduate programs inclusion of the thesis titles, supervisors and indicators of progress could be helpful evidence as well. The program may also wish to look at the overall engagement of faculty in supervision work and success.

12 Ralph, E.G. (1998). Motivating Teaching in Higher Education: A Manual for Faculty Development. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, Inc.

Using the information provided directly by students, as well as the inferences made about feedback based on evidence of student success and progress through the curriculum, program faculty can evaluate whether feedback is effective and timely. Whether there are or should be informal or formal standards for feedback could be discussed, along with how those standards are communicated to new faculty, teaching assistants or other new comers. Are there opportunities to improve the effectives and timeliness of feedback through sharing of best practices, campus workshops or technological tools (e.g., Blackboard 8.0 features). For graduate programs, a review of students' course taking patterns and length of time to receiving their degrees could be the foundation for a discussion of the adequacy and consistency of the feedback being received.

4. Program faculty consistently review and react to evidence of student outcomes, and take action to improve curriculum, pedagogy, advising, staffing or student support and recruiting.

The most helpful evidence here will be a review of recent assessment data and reports, as well as minutes of meetings in which this evidence has been discussed. A review of curricular actions or changes in teaching syllabi may also reflect some of the modifications that have occurred as a result of assessment. Faculty may have attended discipline-based teaching workshops that have suggested ways to improve student learning outcomes that are now reflected in the curricula.

The analysis here could be of the adequacy of the overall assessment process, particularly the ways that evidence is shared and discussed across time. Are enough faculty participating in the effort? Are there ways the review of evidence could be more useful? Is the information collected from students helpful? Is there an assessment effort which is not worth the time it takes? Program leaders are discouraged from letting the conversation stop here. Most programs have at least some data worthy of review. After discussion of process, evaluating the actual need for additional changes in curriculum, pedagogy or advising should occur. Other questions could be the extent to which all students are achieving the intended outcomes. Are there notable shortcomings? Conclusions reached can be the foundation for the Next Steps document to be included at the final section.

C. Student Support and Advising

1. Evidence collected from and about students in the program demonstrates they are effectively advised by program faculty. Where the advising is less than effective, plans are being implemented to respond.

Students who are advised well are more likely to complete a program of study successfully and within a reasonable time period. Evidence relative to the quality of advising may come from departmental surveys of its own students or alumni surveys. A transcript review of a random selection of students may also reveal student course taking patterns that suggest effective advising or the needs for additional advice. The time it takes students to graduate and the number of courses it takes students to graduate is something that should be reviewed thoroughly as well. Finally since advisers can also play key roles in the next steps students take after graduation, job placement or graduate admission rates may provide some evidence of the effectiveness of advising.

2. There are informal opportunities for students and faculty in the program to interact and those opportunities contribute constructively to students' educational, professional, and/or personal development.

The number of and attendance at program-based guest speakers or performers, social gatherings (e.g., dinners, lunches, pot lucks, etc.) and local chapters of student professional organizations could also be supplied as evidence with respect to the opportunities students have to interact informally with faculty. Widely disseminated notification of faculty office hours with 'drop-ins' encouraged could also be used as evidence.

After reviewing the above evidence, the department could ask whether the level of interaction opportunities are satisfactory. Is there a good balance between social and professional focus in the activities? Is the student professional organization functioning well? Are there ways to use informal opportunities to better prepare students for post-graduation? Is there an equitable engagement of faculty in there interactions or do just a few faculty become involved? Are all of the current activities worth doing, or should one or more be dropped?

3. The program attracts quality graduate students and supports them in ways that enhance their education.

Evidence with respect to graduate student quality could include students' entering characteristics, the percentage applicants who attend, as well as students' success rates within the program, including the quality of their final paper, thesis or exam. Evidence with respect to the adequacy of support could include the graduate student stipends, the number and how they are used. How the responsibility for chairing theses and dissertations is distributed across qualified faculty in the department and the number of students who finish the program would also be useful evidence to review. Some programs may decide to do a special survey of graduate students to discern their perceptions of the support given to them.

After reviewing all these data, the obvious question is, are students receiving adequate support? Another is, are the right students being supported? Is the support provided enhancing their educational goals?

4. CMU's department and college resources support student learning in the program.

Programs going through review are asked to complete both library[13] and information technology[14] resources worksheets in consultation with staff in those areas. Those worksheets can serve as the basis for evaluations in this area.

The review of this evidence creates a prime opportunity to look at what will be needed in the future as the content, electronic learning tools, and pedagogies in the field change. Often significant additions in this arena take years to implement so being proactive in anticipating these needs will assure program quality can be sustained and improved across time. After review of the worksheets, conversations could also surround whether all students, faculty or staff are able to access the library or information resources they need and whether there are likely to be needs for training, professional development or technology in the near future. Are any of these critical to faculty or student success and therefore need to be given priority?

D. Overall Understanding of Quality

1. The program's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of effectiveness that is also used to support currency and continuous improvement of the program.

The narrative in this section should highlight the nature of the evaluations and assessments, the results obtained and how those results have been used to reinforce or change the program. An example of an appropriate narrative for this section could describe a 30% D-F-W rate in a junior-level required course that was reduced to 15% after the program began to enforce prerequisites through SLCM. A description of the plans for monitoring problems uncovered in the future would also be appropriate here to address CMU's interest in continuous improvement.

There may be overlap between this section and earlier discussions of assessment and how evidence has been used to improve the program. If so, referring to the earlier section regarding assessment would be appropriate. Evaluation of other functions like advising probably will fall into this section.

2. The program maintains sufficient enrollment to support a sufficient number of advanced courses, appropriate to the field of study. A plan is in place and actions taken to assure an optimal number of students is maintained.

To assure quality given competing demands for resources, program need to enroll enough students and have the attention of more than one faculty member. Conversely, some programs may have too many students, meaning students cannot get courses they need. Evidence with respect to enrollment trends and course sizes should be evaluated for conclusions about

13 http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/programreview/Program_Review_Library_Survey.pdf
14 http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/programreview/InformationTechnologySurvey.doc

appropriate size. If the program is not presently at an appropriate size, plans for modifying the size could be included in the self-study.
Questions faculty might add could include, does all major maps still reflect how our courses are offered and are students able to enroll in the courses they need in the sequence suggested by the major maps? If problems are identified with course offerings by other departments, program review can be used to seek an improved arrangement with this other department.

3. Courses, grades and curricular structures are regularly reviewed in light of assessment outcomes, student retention and time to graduation. That evidence is used to continually improve the curriculum, teaching, advising, recruiting and faculty development.

CMU is committed to raising academic standards and performance. It is in response to this criterion that program faculty should discuss grading standards and how those are or could be used to strengthen student achievement. What are the processes program faculty use to share, discuss and react to assessment findings? How are those results mapped on to the individual courses and course sequences? Are students' grades in courses reflective of their knowledge and predictive of their outcomes within the program and afterward? Answers to kinds of questions could be included in this section.

The program review data sets include information on grading practices and some information on students' progression through the curriculum. It is highly desirable for faculty to link these outcomes to student learning outcomes.

A follow up to the above analysis should be a conversation about any particular courses attracting students to the program or leading them to drop out from the program? Are there introductory classes which have been especially good at attracting new majors? Are there place in the curriculum where students seem to stumble? Are there things that could/should be done to assist majors?

E. Preparing for the Future

1. The program is current and competitive with similar programs at other institutions. It prepares students to live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

Evidence with respect to currency and competitiveness can come from many sources. A program may participate in periodic surveys conducted by professional societies or associations that provide comparative data. There are benchmarking services provided for some programs by organizations like Educational Benchmarking. For others there are also published articles or newsletters from discipline-based organizations. Comparing the curriculum, pedagogy, advising, student outcomes or other features of the program with these published resources can create a compelling case for quality and future directions.

When the above types of sources are not available, the program faculty may choose to conduct their own comparisons. The choice of comparison institutions is key and may depend on the issue. Using CMU's official benchmark institutions, Michigan public universities, or a small set of aspirational programs in a particular area could each be appropriate for particular purposes. Obviously, the rationale for inclusion of particular institutions will need to be clear and not subject to claims of cherry picking.

It is assumed that being current and competitive will include preparing students for life and work in a global, diverse and technological society. However, a paragraph or two discussing future trends within the field, society or globally, can substantiate the future focus that can be useful as the future of the program is considered.

For some programs that emphasize global and other diversity related topics, it might also be useful to develop a curriculum map for those topics only, showing where basic concepts are introduced and then reinforced and evaluated later in a students' program. Attention to which dimensions of diversity are covered and opportunities to further enrich the curriculum could be discussed. Codifying these things in a curriculum map or other document that can be shared with new and temporary faculty will assure that changes in personnel do not undermine the faculty's interest in integrating diversity content throughout the curriculum.

2. The program's faculty and student body represent the diversity of the field.

The demographics of the program faculty and students should be compared to that of the discipline when such information is available. The affirmative action office provides a report that is adequate for some disciplines and is included in the audit. For many fields, demographics of new Ph.D.s are available through the Affirmative Action office.[15] Professional associations also publish some of this information and can be referenced as well. The diversity of many CMU faculties does not yet represent the diversity within the newly minted doctorates. Thus, a constructive approach to this criterion would be to outline how the program hopes to address disparities with new hires, replacement of retiring faculty, supporting success of current faculty from diverse backgrounds, etc.

3. The program reflects and contributes to advances within the discipline through original scholarship, application of disciplinary scholarships to new areas and the learning demonstrated by graduates of the program.

A discussion with appropriate citations of the current state of the discipline

15 Turner, C.S.V. (2002). Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees. Washington, D.C.: AAC&U. Also, Minority & Women Doctoral Directory (MWDD), Fall 2008. This is a national listing of minority and women doctoral students who have recently received or are soon to receive their doctoral degree.

and how the program is responding to assure its currency and relevance is what is being called for here. A curricular example could be a particular discipline that has realized graduates really need to have stronger mathematical and statistical training so they better understand scholarship in the field, which is increasingly based on statistical analyses. A discussion within a self-study could briefly discuss these issues within a discipline and evaluate the extent to which CMU's program has addressed these evolving needs. All external reviewers should be asked to speak to the currency of the curriculum and pedagogies in their written report.

There are many disciplines that are advocating new pedagogies to foster learning. How those new pedagogies have been incorporated and are being discussed could bolster claims in this section. References to publications in the field help to substantiate the validity of the claims.

Another source of evidence to support claims regarding the extent to which the program is advancing the state of the discipline would be the published scholarship of faculty, especially when evidence of how that scholarship is incorporated within students' experiences within the program. One faculty member for example may have developed a series of case studies and supplementary materials for instructors that have been published in a discipline-based journal and are used in CMU classes. Another may have discovered a new phenomenon that has had significant impact on the field and this could be documented in the self-study by a summary of the citations to that work.

In the preparation of the self-study, the program may wish to conduct a citation analysis for all of its faculty or faculty in a particular area of strength. Using purchased software, CMU's library staff can conduct such analysis. Faculty should contact Academic Affairs where we can direct you to the appropriate library staff for more information on this service.

Responsibilities in Academic Affairs

Throughout the program review process, Academic Affairs serves in a supporting role to the department chairs, program directors, college deans, and staff on behalf of the provost. Academic Affairs maintains a variety of documents on a program review website[16] can help directors/chairs understand a suggested timeline, tips for conducting an informative self-study, examples of questions to consider as criteria to address, and a data set that can offer objective, empirical evidence to substantiate claims made throughout the report. Since the work is handled by different individuals within Academic Affairs, the typical delegation of responsibilities is listed below.

Scheduling - Director Curriculum and Assessment
If a program cannot or should not reasonably undergo program review as scheduled, the dean must contact the Vice Provost to provide a rationale and request that the review be rescheduled.

Program Review Data Set - Director, Special Projects
The program review data set is compiled using data housed within the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Institutional Research, and Academic Affairs. It contains a plethora of information, ranging from enrollment counts and graduation counts, to faculty research productivity, to mean grades assigned, and more. This data set is offered as a service to programs as they begin review.

Recommendations Emerging from Program Review - Provost
A list of recommendations is provided following the meeting between the provost, dean, and the program director/department chair once the program review is complete. These recommendations are based on the self-study external reviews, university documents, and the conversation between parties.

Tracking Follow Up Actions - Vice Provost
The provost's recommendations will typically include a date by which actions are to be taken. Reports should be submitted to the provost with a copy to the vice provost prior to the date of discussion in the memo.

Modified Program Review - Vice Provost
Should a program director believe a program should be a candidate for modified program review (see page 9), this issue should be discussed by the dean and the vice provost to obtain approval.

Survey Support - Research Analyst
If a program director feels it could benefit from administering a survey of alumni, recent graduates, or current students, the research analyst in Academic Affairs can assist them in the creation and development of the survey. Academic Affairs can also coach the responsible individuals on administration of the survey and can assist with the analysis, interpretation, and reporting, if requested.

16 http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/programreview/

Appendix A: Department Audit

The purpose of the department audit is to examine departmental records and data to be sure they have been updated regularly and continue to provide the evidence to support the claims made when addressing self-study criteria. Typically the department audits are conducted by Academic Affairs staff and the department chair the summer before a program is scheduled to undergo program review. The department audit examines evidence such as master course syllabi, assessment plans, and departmental bylaws. For each criterion, a score of "+", "0", or "-" is assigned and reported following the audit. A full list of audit items by criterion, including how departments can earn a "+", are listed in detail below. A "+" represents that the criterion is met, a "0" denotes that nothing could be found for that criterion, and a "-" means that the criterion does not meet an acceptable standard for program review purposes (e.g., out-of-date information). The final score report for department audit is presented as the number of +/0/-.

Table 8. Criteria Used for the Department Audit
Department Leadership
1. The departmental mission statement is published in appropriate locations. (To earn a "+", the department mission statement must be published in at least two locations.)
2. Key responsibilities for each academic program (e.g., advising, assessment and curricular currency) have been designated. (To earn a "+", key responsibilities have clearly been designated to a certain individual/committee.)
3. The department has a clear mission statement that is tied to the university and college missions, and has goals and objectives that are designed to assist it in achieving its mission. (To earn a "+", the department has a mission statement and at least 6 statements align or are tied to the university mission statement and the department mission has at least one goal or objective.)
4. The department regularly monitors progress toward achieving its mission, goals and objectives. (To earn a "+", the department has demonstrated some kind of yearly review to evaluate progress toward the mission, goals and objectives.)
5. The department maintains accurate and accessible financial records. (To earn a "+", the program must show that financial records are kept and reviewed monthly by the department chair. Any recommendations made by internal audit have been implemented.)
6. The department employs faculty and staff whose gender/racial/ethnic diversity reflects that in the discipline and region. (To earn a "+", the department is not required to hire any females or minorities in the next 5 years to have a faculty that reflects the diversity of available faculty.)

Bylaws
7. The department maintains and regularly updates bylaws that govern its operations. (To earn a "+", the department has bylaws on record with Faculty Personnel Services. These must be reviewed every three years.)
8. Departmental bylaws articulate clearly the governance and decision-making structures of the department. (To earn a "+", the bylaws must clearly define the role of the chair and list the department committees.
9. Departmental bylaws include multiple measures documenting both the quality and quantity of faculty performance. (To earn a "+", the bylaws should detail at least four measures of quality and quantity of faculty perfomance in teaching effectiveness. The bylaws also should detail at least two measures for both scholarly and creative activity and university and professional service.)
Academic Processes
10. Master course syllabi are on file for all courses and the bulletin class list matches the master course syllabi list. (To earn a "+", at least 90% of MCS need to be on file.)
11. Master course syllabi are updated at least once every five years. (To earn a "+", at least 90% of MCS cannot be past due.)
12. Assessment plans for all programs are approved and up to date. (To earn a "+", all department assessment plans should be approved and up to date. They must be updated every seven years.)
13. Annual reports are filed with the Assessment Council. (To earn a "+", all department assessment reports must have been filed for the last three years.)
Other
14. Articulation agreements and similar means of facilitating the transfer of community college students exist for the largest undergraduate programs. (To earn a "+", the department has to have at least one articulation agreement for its largest undergraduate program on file with Academic Affairs.)
15. The department maintains records of students pursuing Plan A and Plan B. (To earn a "+", the department must have a record of the number of students pursuing Plan A or Plan B.)
The number of +, 0, and - are then reported.

Appendix B: Interdisciplinary Programs Criteria for Department Audit

Interdisciplinary programs cannot address all the criteria as programs associated with a single department. Therefore, the criteria for the "department audit" are different to accommodate the information the program is able to offer and the information required for the review process. As with the department audit, the final score report is presented as the number of +/0/-.

Table 9. Interdisciplinary Programs' Criteria for Department Audit
Program Leadership
1. Key responsibilities for the program (e.g., advising, assessment and curricular currency) have been assigned.
2. If there is a budget associated with the program, there are accurate and accessible financial records.
Bylaws
3. The program bylaws are up to date and on file in Academic Affairs.
Academic Processes
4. Master course syllabi are on file for all courses and the bulletin class list matches the master course syllabi list.
5. Master course syllabi are updated at least once every five years.
6. Assessment plan is approved and up to date.
7. Annual reports are filed with the Assessment Council.
Other
8. If applicable, the department maintains records of students pursuing Plan A and Plan B.

Index

P

R

S

T