

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

2021-2026

PROGRAM REVIEW OVERVIEW

- 5-year cycle uses data, annual work plans, and assessment database reports to examine state of program and set goals for upcoming five years
- 2-3 programs reviewed each year
- Program review is an essential function of assessment process and is led by faculty of each academic program with support from various offices on campus
- Reviewers complete report for Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), which is composed of faculty and key employees
- Committee oversees program review process, provides support and training, and evaluates the program reviews
 - Committees make an official recommendation to (1) continue the program, (2) continue the program with suggested modifications, or (3) discontinue the program.
 - This recommendation is supported by rationale (less than 1 page summary of program review) and submitted to the Board of Regent.
 - Committee also passes determination and rationale Dean's Cabinet, identifying positions or departments responsible for responding to any requests or recommendations by the program.
- Dean's Cabinet develops feedback report for committee and program, outlining next steps for addressing recommendations
- IDEA Committee receives summary and feedback report

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (APRC)

Standing committee of Faculty Senate.

- Oversees program review process throughout the year, ensures trainings and data are provided in a timely manner.
- Provides training and support throughout program review.
- Reads program reviews and makes recommendations to program Cabinet. Recommendations include (1) Decision regarding future of program (continue, continue with modifications, or discontinue) and (2) Rationale for decision.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- Institutional Researcher
- Director of Business Services
- Executive Director of Enrollment
- Two faculty who participated in program review previous year
 - Determined by volunteers. In the absence of volunteers, faculty will be selected by ECOS of Faculty Senate

- Additional 2 faculty to serve rotating two-year terms
 - Selected by Faculty Senate

TIMELINE

- 6 months to write review (part of fall semester, winter, and part of spring), no faculty involvement over summer

Date	Event
October 1	Programs notified of upcoming program review
October 15	Faculty complete training with APRC – discuss process, timeline, and content of review
November 1	Deadline for all programs to receive supplemental reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plan 5-Year Summary (IDEA Committee) • Assessment Database Reports (Bryon Steinwand and Division Director) • Program Snapshot (Institutional Research) • 5-Year Budget Summary (Director of Business Services) • Vector Solutions PD Report (Faculty Development)
February 1	APRC Check-In with Program Reviewers. Deadline for program reviewers to meet with each of the areas mentioned in previous step
April 1	Program reviews submitted to APRC
May 1	APRC recommendation/rationale/summary submitted to Cabinet.
September 1	Final Cabinet feedback sent to program and APRC
October 15	Annual Academic Program Review Report submitted to MUS Board of Regents Summary and feedback shared to IDEA Committee

REPORT

To be completed within Assessment Database.

- 1) Mission, goals, and objectives
 - a. Give department mission and align to institution
 - b. Update on each goal/recommendation from previous review
 - c. Reflect on last five years of AWP goals – completed, ongoing, not completed
 - d. Highlight successes and strengths of last 5 years
 - e. Describe significant challenges of last 5 years
 - f. *Supplement: AWP 5-Year Summary*
- 2) Student Learning
 - a. List program learning outcomes
 - b. Reflect on assessment activities of last 5 years
 - c. What curriculum/assessment changes resulted from assessment and mapping?
 - d. *Supplement: Report(s) from Assessment Database*
- 3) Data review:

- a. *Supplement: Program snapshot*
 - i. Market analysis (job openings, wages, or transfer rates)
 - ii. Degree/certificate production
 - iii. Retention
 - iv. Annual FTE
 - v. Financial Impact per FTE (Revenue-Cost)/FTE
 - b. Reflect on numbers, trends, and what has happened to influence the numbers
 - i. What has happened since the last data were collected? Are there mitigating factors within the last year that would help the APRC make a decision for continuation, discontinuation, or continuation with modification?
 - ii. If there was dramatic improvement or decline in the last two years for one or more assessment criteria, what explains the changes?
 - iii. Do you have any reason to believe these numbers are incorrect? How or why?
- 4) Resources – current and needed
- a. Document current full-time faculty and credentials, as well as support staff and related administrators
 - b. Highlight significant professional development activities
 - c. Review budget: any changes in revenue and/or expenses in last 5 years?
 - d. Identify resource needs – including but not limited to, financial, physical, human, or professional development/training
 - e. *Supplement: 5-Year Budget Summary*
 - f. *Supplement: PD report from Vector Solutions*
- 5) Summary and goals for next five years
- a. Identify goals, recommendations, preliminary strategy for accomplishing
 - b. Will be tied to annual work plans
 - c. Summarize needed resources from section 4.
- 6) APRC Committee Determination & Rationale
- a. Continue, Continue with Modification, or Discontinue Program
 - b. Supporting rationale for decision
 - c. Identify responsible parties for addressing needed resources
- 7) Dean’s Cabinet Feedback