

Evaluating CMU's Academic Program Review Process

Greetings!

Our records indicate you participated in the review of an academic program between 2005 and 2008. Since we value your opinions on the ease of the process, we would like to offer you the opportunity to share with us ways it could be improved. As you will notice, this questionnaire has been divided into several categories to focus your attention on specific areas of program review:

- Strategic Objectives
- Evaluation of Specific Program Review Components
- Guidance for Programs Undergoing Review in the Future
- Background Demographics

We greatly appreciate any advice you can offer to assist us as we improve the process for future programs. At the end of the questionnaire, we hope you take a minute to write comments or provide additional feedback that others may find helpful.

Thank you for your participation!

Catherine Riordan
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

1. The goal of program review is to improve academic programs through the processes of collecting evidence relative to quality, shared reflection regarding a program's current status and future directions, and constructive feedback through peer and administrative review.

The following questions invite you to rate the extent to which program review was effective in achieving those goals for one or more programs in which you are involved:

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Not effective	Counterproductive to achieving goals	Not Applicable (N/A)
Stimulating use of evidence in analyzing program quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Focusing on student learning outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading to greater understanding of program by dean	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prompting meaningful <u>conversations</u> about program <u>quality</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prompting meaningful <u>conversations</u> about program <u>future</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<u>Planning</u> future of program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading to <u>actions</u> by faculty in support of program quality and future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading to actions by dean in support of program quality and future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading to actions by provost in support of program quality and future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Evaluating CMU's Academic Program Review Process

2. While the focus of program review is improvement of a particular program, the process often provides a better understanding of opportunities that exist in a department as a whole.

The following questions ask you to rate the extent to which the process was effective in achieving better understanding of department needs:

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Not effective	Counterproductive to understanding needs	Not Applicable (N/A)
Stimulating use of evidence in analyzing department criteria	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Identifying strengths and weaknesses in departmental structures and responsibilities	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

1. Type of program review process:

- Full
- Abbreviated (program completed an agency-specified self-study)
- Modified (program completed unique self-study not associated with specialized accreditation)

1. Program review has a number of components.

To what extent did each component contribute to accomplishment of actions important to the quality of the program?

	This component contributed substantially	This component contributed slightly	This component did not contribute	No opinion	Not applicable (N/A)
Audit	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Dataset provided by Academic Affairs	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Self study process overall	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Specific criteria to be addressed in the self study	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Library Resources Form	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
External Review	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
SWOT	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Conversations with dean about the process	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Culminating interview	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Numerical ratings of program quality and need for resources	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Feedback from provost	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Follow up actions requested by provost	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Other follow up actions taken by faculty	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

Evaluating CMU's Academic Program Review Process

1. Program review has a number of components.

To what extent did each component contribute to accomplishment of actions important to the quality of the program?

	This component contributed substantially	This component contributed slightly	This component did not contribute	No opinion	Not applicable (N/A)
Audit	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Dataset provided by Academic Affairs	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Library Resources Form	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
External Review	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
SWOT	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Conversations with dean about the process	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Culminating interview	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Numerical ratings of program quality and need for resources	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Feedback from provost	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Follow up actions requested by provost	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Other follow up actions taken by faculty	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Feedback from accrediting body	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

1. Do you have suggestions for how any of the above components could be improved? (optional)

2. Do you have suggestions for adding a new component or deleting any of the above components? (optional)

3. Was there any data that you needed that you did not have?
If so, please list. (optional)

Evaluating CMU's Academic Program Review Process

1. How helpful were the program review workshops sponsored by Academic Affairs prior to undergoing review (April & October)?

Very helpful

Counterproductive to understanding process

Slightly helpful

Did not attend (N/A)

Not helpful

2. What was the most valuable aspect of the Program Review workshops?

3. What advice would you give us as we plan for future Program Review workshops?

4. How helpful was the program review website?

(<http://academicaffairs.cmich.edu/programreview.shtml>)

Very helpful

Counterproductive to understanding the process

Slightly helpful

Did not visit the website (N/A)

Not helpful

5. Do you have any suggestions to improve the program review website?

If so, please list.

1. Some areas of program review may have been more challenging than others. If you have suggestions for how to improve program review in a specific area, please comment below. (optional)

Getting faculty involved

Using evidence of student learning and other outcomes

Using evidence provided by Academic Affairs or other institutional data

Writing self-study

Timely progress on self-study

Picking good external reviewer and getting good feedback

Coming toward consensus on the SWOT

Following up on actions requested by the provost

Other

Evaluating CMU's Academic Program Review Process

1. Your role: (please check all that apply)

- Dean or Associate Dean
- Chair or Program Director
- Program faculty or staff

2. Academic year in which your review(s) occurred: (please check all that apply)

- 2004-2005
- 2005-2006
- 2006-2007
- 2007-2008
- Don't remember

3. Your role in the creation of the self-study: (please check all that apply)

- Collected evidence
- Provided analysis
- Assisted in writing self-study
- Assisted in writing SWOT
- Convened discussions of faculty
- Convened discussions of students
- Convened discussions of external stakeholders
- Identified external reviewers
- Hosted external reviewer
- Updated master course syllabus (MCS)
- Worked with auditor
- Carried out follow-up action
- Notified provost and dean of follow-up action

4. Where is the program(s) that was(were) reviewed housed? (please check all that apply)

- College of Business Administration
- College of Communication & Fine Arts
- College of Education & Human Services
- The Herbert H. and Grace A. Dow College of Health Professions
- College of Humanities and Social & Behavioral Sciences
- College of Science and Technology
- College of Graduate Studies
- Off-Campus Programs
- Academic Affairs