Seattle University
Program Review Guidelines

Table of Contents

I.   Program Review Information Sheet

Introduction

The program review process at Seattle University is intended to serve as a catalyst for the faculty of each program to reflect on their program's contribution to engaged learning, academic rigor, and the university's mission and values. The review is outcomes and data based and is embedded in a strategic planning framework that focuses on program strengths/weaknesses and challenges/ opportunities. The review process provides program faculty with the opportunity to systematically reflect on their past successes and opportunities for improvement, to demonstrate the vitality and academic excellence of their offerings and their students, and to be accountable to colleagues in the wider university community.

Program review guidelines are constructed to ensure that all programs will provide certain basic information along with the freedom to develop their own questions and pursue their own concerns within the larger context of the program review. Programs will present an analysis of evidence for student learning and the effectiveness of curriculum and program delivery. Central to the review process is an assessment of the extent to which graduates are meeting university and program learning outcomes. In addition, program review is an opportunity for faculty to communicate the quality of their program to the university at large, to dialogue with an external reviewer from the discipline, and to focus attention on strategic planning.

Program faculty, in collaboration with the Dean, the Academic Assembly, and the Provost will determine any needed changes to the program, additional resources, strategic initiatives and new directions. In addition, dates for reporting progress and for completing the implementation of agreed on changes will be established.

Program Review Cycle

All programs with the exception of externally accredited programs are on a seven-year review cycle. Externally accredited programs are cycled according to their external accreditation timelines. Generally, the university program review follows the year after the completion of an external accreditation. Programs may submit their external accreditation report in lieu of following the program review guidelines. However, programs are responsible for ensuring that all items in the university review are either included in their external review or are submitted with their external review to the Office of the Provost. Externally reviewed programs must also clearly identify where in their external reviews the pertinent information required in the university review may be found.

Institutional Research, InformSU/PowerBI, Data Resources

The Office of Institutional Research provides direction on the use of the university database (InformSU/PowerBI) to access data for the program review. In addition to information available on InformSU/PowerBI, it is expected that the program/department will make full use of departmentally based data and discipline-based information that is useful toward development of appropriate benchmarks.

Please note that throughout the document, there are suggestions as to the best way to access data in InformSU/PowerBI, particularly differentiating what works with graduate as opposed to undergraduate programs (majors).

Student and Alumni Feedback
Feedback from current students and alumni should be included as part of the program review. Programs should contact Institutional Research for information on how to utilize Qualtrics survey software for current students, and survey data from University Alumni Relations and Career Services for alumni. The data may be limited as regular surveying of alumni has begun only recently, so your response may include noting the limitations of the available survey data. Should programs wish to collect additional data, it is highly recommended that face to face interviews, phone interviews, or focus groups be utilized to complement survey results.

Program/Department Generated Questions
Critical to the success of the program review process are the questions generated by the program as a part of the review. Assuming that your program has faced a variety of challenges over the past seven years, what are the important issues that need to be addressed moving ahead? It is recommended that program faculty articulate these issues at the beginning stages of the review process. These issues and the questions emerging from them can be developed and modified over the course of the program review. Questions should be relevant to program strategic planning. This would include the identification of strengths, opportunities, and challenges in the context of strategic planning for the next seven years.

External Reviewer
All programs, with the exception of those who have had an external visiting team as part of a review by a professional/discipline based accrediting body, will be reviewed by an external reviewer. The purpose of the external review is to provide the program with input as to best practices, feedback on program quality and resources, and input on department/program strategic planning initiatives. Academic Affairs provides $2,500 per program review for one external reviewer, which is divided between a $1,500 honorarium and $1,000 for travel and lodging. If at all possible, the external review should take place either during winter quarter or at the beginning of spring quarter.

Programs are encouraged to choose reviewers from programs reputed to follow best practices and who are aspirational in relationship to their own program.

Nominations/recommendations for the external reviewer (up to three names) are to be forwarded from the program chair to the dean. Program faculty should disclose any prior professional and/or personal relationships with the nominees and ascertain availability of reviewer(s) prior to submitting names to the Dean. The Dean will choose the external reviewer. The department sends the letter of invitation to the reviewer and hosts the reviewer during the visit. The department should arrange meetings with students, the Dean, the Associate Provost, and of course departmental faculty, etc.

The guidelines for the external reviewer, a brief list of questions and instructions, and a profile of the university, should be forwarded to the reviewer prior to their visit (this document can be found in Section III).

Timeline, Submission, and Questions
A timeline for program review can be found in Section V of this document. When your completed program review is ready for consideration by Academic Assembly, please deliver one printed copy and one electronic copy to the Office of the Provost, ATTN: Program Review. The submission must be in a binder with a table of contents, page numbers, and all documents/sections clearly marked, including the program review, the external reviewer's report, the departmental response, and the dean's letter.

II.   Program Review Process

1. Narrative Guidelines

Program review is a stock-taking and strategic planning exercise for academic programs: strengths, weaknesses, challenges and opportunities. These guidelines are meant to provide programs with an overview of the requirements for program review while allowing latitude for programs to delve into areas they deem important to their future well-being. Critical to the review process is faculty fully engaging in the review of their work and student outcomes in a rigorous and dedicated fashion.

A.   Departmental Overview
Include highlights and issues since the last review. Briefly describe the learning objectives/outcomes of your program in relation to the University Mission and to either the Undergraduate Learning Objectives or Graduate Learning Outcomes.

B.   Program Performance
1. Analysis based on Program Data (section II.5.) including numbers of applicants, majors, retention and graduation rates, etc.
2. Student feedback on advising, advising ratios, professional vs. faculty advisors.

C.   Strengths and Weaknesses
Review the strengths and weaknesses of the program including the following. Additional dimensions/factors may be addressed and added under separate categories of the program's designation as desired.
1. Faculty Data: scholarship productivity, critical service, teaching loads.
2. Curriculum and Learning Outcomes
   a. Demonstrate students' achievement of the program's learning outcomes.
      i. Demonstrate that the program's learning outcomes provide adequate coverage of the field as defined by relevant standards of the field.
      ii. Provide a review of how the overall program outcomes are integrated throughout the curriculum. In other words, how does each course and its outcomes fit with other courses/course outcomes to present a coherent curriculum that provides students the necessary knowledge and skills to achieve the program outcomes? (Provide a curriculum map.)
      iii. Using assessment data from the past five years (for non-externally accredited programs) provide an overview and an analysis of the extent to which students are achieving the program's learning outcomes.
      iv. Using the same assessment data, address how the program determines if the level of academic rigor in its courses is appropriate.
   b. Indicate if and where there are gaps:
      i. In curriculum coherence and progress through course levels.
      ii. Student achievement and faculty expectations.
      iii. Curriculum: Desired outcomes compared to degree of student attainment; assessment/measurement strategies compared to evidence produced; and desired levels of rigor compared to actual levels of rigor.
3. Students and Alumni
   a. Student Success: awards, graduate school admissions, mission-focused work post-graduation, employment, etc.
   b. Current Student Feedback: Analysis of survey/focus group results.
   c. Alumni Feedback: Analysis of survey results and employment data.
4. Advising

       a. Description of advising model (e.g. faculty only, mix of faculty and professional, professional only).

       b. Data on advising ratios.

       c. Explain and assess the effectiveness of activities undertaken by program to accomplish the faculty advising responsibilities (as listed in the Coordinated Undergraduate Advising System or required by the graduate program goals).

5. Program Governance

       a. Provide an overview of faculty governance within your program.

       b. Describe the processes and norms by which views of all full time tenured/tenure track/non-tenure track faculty are considered in the departmental governance structure and decision making. (How are decisions made? Who participates in decisions? etc.)

       c. Provide a review of governance over the past seven years, including any significant issues and how they were addressed.

6. Program Support within Seattle University
(This is an optional section and provides the program with an opportunity to review issues of program support internal to the university environment.)

D. **Challenges and Opportunities (external to the university).**
Discuss and analyze the current challenges facing the program with respect to:

1. Growth and student recruitment.

       a. Academic preparation of entering students.

2. When relevant, comparison with comparable programs.
3. Employment and graduate admission post-graduation.
4. Program expansion into other areas, e.g., continuing education.
5. Additional challenges.

E. **Future Plans (seven-year timeframe)**
Based on the analysis in this program review:

1. What are the overriding goals for the program?
2. What are the critical issues facing the program with respect to increasing education effectiveness, academic excellence, and program development?
3. What are the critical strategies that the program intends to implement to meet the challenges and opportunities discussed in section D, above?

       a. Shift resources internally

       b. More effective use of resources

       c. Collaboration across programs

       d. Streamline offerings

       e. Leverage other university resources to enhance programming

4. What resource needs will the program have in the next seven years in light of these future plans?
5. How do you plan to obtain these resources?

F. **Executive Summary**
Brief summary covering the major points of the program review.

2. *Appendices*

A. **Curriculum and Program Effectiveness**

1. Copy of Curriculum
2. Assessment documentation (Curriculum/courses and Advising)
3. Grade Distribution Data (By course type)
4. Sample Assignments and Student Work

B. **Student Achievement**

1. Student Awards

2. Graduate School Admissions Data
3. Employment Data
4. Service Work after graduation
   C.   **Faculty**
1. Faculty Vitae
2. List of faculty research, scholarship, artistic production
3. List of critical university service by faculty
   D.   **Surveys**
1. Students
2. Alumni

3. *Student Survey*

Programs should be engaged in regular surveys of their students. The program review is the occasion to review the data from surveys from the past seven years and identify relevant trends and/or patterns. Ideally the survey is built into the ongoing work of the program. In addition, programs must interview current students and provide their feedback in the program review. The program review must address any issues raised by students.

   A.   **Important information to include from data in student surveys:**
1. Students perception of academic challenge
2. How well they felt the program met their personal objectives
3. How well they were served/supported as they progressed through the program
4. Any concerns they have about the program or their participation in it
5. Overall satisfaction
6. Advising (Student satisfaction, experience of assistance, connection with program related activities, mentoring, and academic support.)

   B.   **Data may be gathered by:**
1. A block of questions added to all course evaluations
2. Yearly focus groups

4. *Alumni Survey*

Programs should contact Institutional Research for survey data from University Alumni Relations and Career Services. Respond to the data as available from these offices in your review. The data may be limited as regular surveying of alumni has begun only recently, so your response may include noting the limitations of the available survey data. Face to face interviews, phone interviews, or focus groups may be utilized to complement survey results. Suggested areas for assessment include, but are not limited to:

   A. Alumni's educational pursuits and professional experience after graduation (employment data).
   B. The program's contribution to alumni's academic and professional development.
   C. Alumni's satisfaction with their SU degree.
   D. Reflect on your educational experience as a _____major or _____program graduate.

5. *Program Data (please see "How-to" document for InformSU/PowerBI use)*

After each data point, it is indicated whether the program will provide this data directly or whether it is available either through InformSU/PowerBI. Use graphs and tables when appropriate.

   A.   **Students**
1. Demand for the Program
      a. Number of majors, full and part time, first time in college (FTIC) and Transfers. Programs/majors are encouraged to provide demographic data related to gender,

ethnicity, age, or related issues, to support discussion of these issues. (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

    b. What are the seven-year enrollment numbers for the program? (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>) (Undergraduate programs, search by "major" instead of "program")

2. Admission data (populate with tables)

    a. How many FTIC students list the program as their desired program upon entry? (undergraduate only) (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

    b. How many transfer students list the program as their desired program upon entry? (undergraduate only) (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

    c. Percentage of students admitted versus percentage that applied for admission. (graduate only) (Program)

3. Longitudinal Admissions data for the past seven years. (populate with tables)(<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

B.   **Graduation and Retention**

1. Number of degrees, certificates awarded over the past five years. (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

2. How many FTIC students graduate from the program? (undergraduate only and search by "major" for this data) (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

3. How many transfer students graduate from the program? ((<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>) For items 1-3, undergraduate programs should search by "major" and not "program."

4. Graduate school or professional school placement/admissions. (<u>Program</u>)

5. Employment post-graduation. (<u>Program</u>)

6. Service/volunteer work post-graduation. (<u>Program</u>)
For questions 4-6, Qualtrics survey software is a good option.

C.   **Program Faculty**

1. Fill out and attach a copy of your faculty workload profile. (<u>Program</u>)

2. What proportion of the faculty have terminal degrees in the program discipline? (<u>Program</u>)

3. How many years of experience do the faculty have in the discipline/profession (in professional programs where years of experience is relevant)? (<u>Program</u>)

4. At the department level, what are the numbers for, and the ratio of, *budgeted* faculty FTE and student FTE? (Institutional Research)

5. What percentage of major courses are being taught by tenured/tenure track faculty? (Institutional Research)

6. If you have budgeted faculty that are unavailable to teach and for whom you have not received replacement workload sevenths, please provide details and indicate how this situation is affecting the delivery of your program. (Program)

D.   **Program Curriculum**

1. List of major programs and/or degrees offered (<u>Program</u>)

2. Program entrance requirements where applicable (<u>Program</u>)

3. Identify placement exams, e.g., Math, Language or other program placement exams. (<u>Program</u>)

E.   **Program Size and Productivity**

1. How many student credit hours are generated by the program? (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

2. What is the average class size in the program by class level, 1000, 2000, etc.? (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

F. **Internal Demand for the Program (undergraduate only)**
1. Courses offered in the University Core Curriculum? Enrollment numbers in courses? (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>) Only use Core data from 2013 on.
   Please note that F.2 and 3 are optional questions. The intent of these questions is to allow programs/majors to address issues of additional responsibilities and stresses on delivery of program/major. Data for past year (complete academic year) and other data as relevant, if there have been significant changes.
2. What percentage of students taking major courses are enrolled in majors outside of the program? (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)
3. Which courses offered in the major/program are required for the success of other majors? What are the enrollment numbers in these courses? (<u>InformSU/PowerBI</u>)

G. **Workload distribution**
1. What is the number, percentage and level of courses taught by tenured/tenure track, full time non-tenure track and part time faculty? (<u>Program</u>)
2. What is the teaching load in the program for full time tenure track and non-tenure track faculty? (<u>Program</u>)
3. List course releases for faculty by academic year. (<u>Program</u>)

III.   Guidelines for External Reviewer

Seattle University is a Masters Comprehensive Jesuit Catholic University located in Seattle, Washington. Thank you for agreeing to participate in the university's program review process. Degree granting academic programs conduct reviews on a seven-year cycle. The intent of the program review process is to provide an opportunity for retrospective self-study and for the purposes of strategic planning.

External evaluations are a critical component to the program review process.   You will be provided with the program review guidelines, the program review, any additional materials from the program and a packet of general information on Seattle University. During your visit you will have the opportunity to meet with program faculty, students, academic dean, and associate provost. Should you wish to meet with other members of Seattle University, please direct your request to the department chair or program director.

After the campus visit, please prepare a report including significant findings, and recommendations to the program and to the university administration. The report should be at least seven pages in length and include the following sections.

Overview
Program Strengths
Overall Challenges
Specific Challenges within the Program
       Proposed Solutions for each challenge identified
Methodology: How did the process of the visit facilitate writing the review?

Within this format, you are encouraged to comment on any aspect of the program review that you feel is significant. In addition you are specifically asked to include the following points:
1.   Review the academic quality of the program based on a review of the curriculum, and an examination of the assessment data. Comment on the extent to which stated learning outcomes appear to be met in rigorous fashion following the standards of the discipline and/or profession.
2.   Comment on representative samples of creative production/scholarship of the faculty in the program and comment on their appropriateness and significance.
3.   Discuss any issues raised when meeting with faculty and student groups from the department as well as faculty and student groups from programs served by the department.
4.   Review the program's analysis of strengths and weaknesses, providing you own input on their analysis based on your observations.
5.   Review program's plans for the future and give a detailed assessment of them in light of the program's plans for resource allocation.
6.   Finally, comment on the overall strength and viability of the program, indicating any additional recommendations, concerns, commendations that you may have.

Please submit your report to the department chair with a copy to the dean. After the completion of the external review, the department and dean of the school or college responds and all documentation including the external review is forwarded to the Academic Assembly (faculty governance body) for further review. The final step is a meeting of the program director, the dean and the provost to discuss the outcomes, recommendations, and future plans for the program.

IV.   Suggestions for Dean's Response

The Dean's response should include feedback surrounding each concern raised by the department and the external reviewer, as well as a summary of the Dean's own analysis of the state of the program and a plan of action.

V.   Schedule and Timeline for Program Review

Program Review Schedule

Programs that are not externally accredited will be reviewed on a seven-year cycle, from the date the completed program review is submitted to Academic Assembly.

Programs that are subject to external reviews by a professional accrediting agency may be reviewed according to that body's timeline. Such programs may choose to be on the seven-year cycle as well. Programs that use their external accreditation reports for the purposes of university program review will be required to supplement those documents with an additional report, supplying information requested in these guidelines that was neither requested by, nor supplied to, the external accrediting agency.

Program Review Timeline
Spring
- Confer with the Provost or Provost's designee to set review process in motion.
- Announce review within department as a priority for the coming year.
- The Associate Provost meets with the Program Chair/Director and Dean, or Dean's designee, to review procedures and establish timelines.

Summer
- The program contacts the Office of Institutional Research with any questions about how to procure the required data from InformSU/PowerBI.

October - December
- The program prepares its own self-study and identifies possible external reviewers submitting those names to the Dean. (Program faculty: note any professional and/or personal relationships with the nominated reviewers. Program should establish availability of reviewers before submitting names to the Dean.) One external reviewer per program. The Dean conveys the choice(s) for external reviewer to the department.

February - April
- Program submits finalized self-study to the Dean and sends copies to the external reviewers.
- External Review
  - External reviewers visit campus and submit a report to Department Chair/Director and Dean of School/College.
- The department's faculty prepares a response to the external reviewer's report and then submits the response to the Dean.

April - May
- The Dean prepares an administrative response to the Program Self-Study and the external consultant's report. The Dean will address the issues raised in the review including issues of academic rigor, assessment, and resource allocation.

June - September
- The Program self-study, the external consultant's report, department response and the Dean's response are then reviewed by the Program Review Committee of Academic Assembly. (See page 3 for submission requirements.)

October
- The Program Review Committee reviews the documents, meets with the Program Chair/Director and Dean (if necessary for clarification), and prepares its memo of recommendation to Academic Assembly.
- Academic Assembly votes to approve/disapprove Program Review Committee memo of recommendation. Academic Assembly forwards its final recommendations to the Provost.
- The Provost, Associate Provost, Dean, and Department Chair/Director meet to discuss the review and Academic Assembly recommendations. They devise an implementation plan.

Updates
If the Academic Assembly and/or the Provost request an update on a particular issue and/or progress report from a program, this will be scheduled by the Office of the Provost.