


| | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| BGSU Firelands | | |
| Governance Document Instruction | Academic Committees | Program Review Report |
| Approved by:  5/10/14 | Date Revised 4-25-14 | FC 4231 |

PURPOSE

Defines the content of a program review report to be submitted by program director, coordinator, or other designated individual to the Program Review Committee (PRC), a subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee, once every six years. The dean and/or the department chair may also request that the unit undergo academic program review more frequently than scheduled.

An effective academic program review process should add value to existing strategic planning activities and pose minimal administrative burdens. With these goals in mind, units that are subject to disciplinary accreditation may, with the approval of the dean, substitute the accreditation process for that of academic program review, providing that the accreditation process materially overlaps with the goals listed above.

Units whose accreditation processes do not substantially overlap with these activities may provide a supplemental document that focuses on those missing elements, as agreed upon by the department chair or program director and the dean. It is expected that the academic program review process should be approached with the same level of seriousness and rigor as is disciplinary accreditation.

Report Criteria and Format

The report will include information from the prior six academic years or since the last review of the program. The PRC acknowledges that some statistical information about programs is difficult to obtain, or that information obtained from different sources may not always agree.

- I. Program Purpose and Learning Outcomes
 - A. The report should begin with a statement outlining the purpose of the program (i.e., why the program exists) and an explanation of the program learning outcomes (i.e., what skills and competencies students should possess when they complete the program).
 - B. How does the program satisfy Ohio Board of Regents requirements (i.e., how does the program meet its communication, general, basic, and technical requirements)? How does the program adhere to university and college degree requirements? How do the core and technical courses support the learning outcomes of the program? (One copy of the most recent syllabi should be available for PRC review for all core and technical courses.)
 - C. How does the program compare with relevant benchmark standards? Benchmark standards are: (1) professional licensing/certification requirements and/or (2) standards set forth by a national accrediting organization; and/or (3) a sister program in Ohio (or another state, when appropriate). If applicable, what is the current accreditation status of the program?
 - D. How do faculty/staff credentials associated with the program at BGSU Firelands compare with the standards outlined in C?
 - E. Does the program transfer into a Bachelor's degree program with a minimum loss of credits? (Examples of transferability should be included.)

- II. Enrollment and Financial Information
 - A. Has enrollment increased, decreased, or remained constant in the program? Enrollment information should include: (1) the number of students enrolled in the program each year and (2) relevant demographic information about these students, such as age, gender, and race. [The Assistant Director of Institutional Research will provide this information annually to department chairs and program directors through the Associate Dean.]
 - B. Programs that have experienced steady decline during the period covered by the report may be asked to comment on their program's cost effectiveness. [This will be done if requested by the administration of BGSU Firelands; pertinent information related to cost effectiveness will be provided to the chair and program director involved by the Office of Budget and Operations.]

III. Assessment of Learning

- A. How does the program insure the assessment of student learning? What are the indicators? How do the indicators relate to the learning outcomes?
- B. How do students who graduate from the program perform at other academic institutions? Graduation and transfer information should include: (1) the number of students who graduated from the program each year and their mean grade point average (GPA), and(2) the number of individuals who went on to Bowling Green's main campus. How successful were these students? [The Assistant Director of Institutional Research will provide this information annually to department chairs and program directors through the Associate Dean.]
- C. How do students who graduate from the program perform in the workplace? How many students acquired related full-time employment? How many students acquired related part-time employment? How do employers evaluate the preparation of the graduates from the program? How do graduates evaluate their preparation? (Summaries of employer and graduate surveys should be included.) [The Office of Career Services will provide this information annually to department chairs, program directors and the Associate Deans.]
- D. What pre-graduation assessment methods of student academic achievement are employed? (Methods may include: specially designed standardized tests, faculty designed comprehensive examinations, capstone courses, portfolios, and performance on professional licensing/certification examinations.) How did students perform? What are the benchmark standards for this evaluation? How does performance compare to benchmark standards?
- E. What inferences were made from this assessment? What actions were taken? In what ways has assessment resulted in improvements in the program? What improvements still need to be accomplished and how are any concerns/ deficiencies being addressed?

IV. Summary and Recommendations

- A. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program as seen by the director and the chair?
- B. Should the program be expanded, maintained, modified, reduced, or eliminated? This recommendation should take into account expected long term market changes and their impact on the program. How will the program achieve this recommendation? What needs to be accomplished (goals), what steps should be taken (methods), and what is the likely timetable?

V. External Review

- A. The external review report should include the elements listed below and should focus on the unit's goals and plans for achieving those goals within the context of all information provided in the self-study. The report's recommendations should focus on improvements that can be made using institutional and extramural resources that currently are available to the program. If recommendations are made for changes that would require additional institutional resources, the need and priority for additional resources should be clearly specified.

Elements of the External Review Report

1. A brief statement naming the program being reviewed, the dates of the visit, and a summary of the major events or scope of the visit.
 2. An identification of strengths and weaknesses of the program. Do the program's teaching and research/creative efforts reflect appropriate degrees of specialization and comprehensiveness? Is there evidence of innovation in pedagogy and research/creative work?
 3. An evaluation of the productivity of the faculty, in teaching, research and service. Is the program's faculty competitive within the context of its mission?
 4. An evaluation of the leadership, including the climate for work created by administrators.
 5. An evaluation of the program's plans for the next six years. Are the program's goals and mission clearly articulated and appropriate? Do these plans reflect insights into the potential of the program to contribute to the discipline, the college, and the university? Are the goals of the unit current and realistic in terms of instruction, research/scholarly/creative efforts, service, and outreach?
- B. The external reviewers should present their major findings and recommendations verbally during the exit interview as well as in a single written report within 30 days of departure from BGSU

- Firelands. The department chair or program director then has the responsibility to report back to the reviewers within two weeks concerning any errors of fact. The external reviewers shall then forward their final report simultaneously to the program director, department chair, and the dean.
- C. The reviewers must be faculty members and/or administrators from programs at peer universities and/or, where appropriate, from the professional sector. The program director will provide names of potential reviewers. Working from this slate of potential reviewers, the program director, department chair, and the dean will come to agreement on a list of potential reviewers. All parties will be sensitive to issues of conflict of interest at all levels.
 - D. The program director is responsible for scheduling and coordinating all other aspects of the external reviewers' visit, including scheduling the travel and lodging arrangements, and an exit interview with the dean. Opportunities should be arranged for reviewers to meet with faculty and staff members of the program or department, department chairs or directors of related programs, and students. The length of time the reviewers are on campus will vary with the size and complexity of the program; a 1 ½ day maximum visit should be sufficient for a review of the programs included in most academic departments. Travel expenses and honoraria for the external reviewers shall be funded by the office of the Provost.
 - E. Materials to be shared with the reviewers well in advance of their visit include:
 1. A copy of the current program review report.
 2. Approved strategic plan templates since the time of the last academic program review, with associated appendices.
 3. An optional document of no more than ten pages that provides additional context for the visit.
 4. A preliminary schedule for the visit (with the understanding that the reviewers may request additional or follow-up interviews or may otherwise choose to modify the proposed schedule).
 5. An information sheet describing the expectations for the focus and content of the external reviewers' report (see section V.A.).
 - F. The external reviewers' visit may be facilitated through the use of technology. For example, materials may be posted to web sites rather than or in addition to printed, or conference calls (before or during the visit) may be used. It is also possible that the entire visit may be conducted remotely, although this must be agreed upon by the program director, department chair, and the dean. A "resource room" of relevant printed materials may also be made available during the external reviewers' visit, as necessary.
 - G. The response to the external reviewer's report that is agreed upon by the program director, department chair, and the dean will inform the next strategic plan update completed by the academic unit. An annual meeting should take place between the Associate Dean and the Director of Academic Assessment to review the major points gained from academic program review.