

Program Reviews at IU Southeast General Policies and Procedures

Purpose

The purpose of conducting academic program reviews at Indiana University Southeast is to sustain and advance academic quality. The process should result in an informed evaluation of the current status of the program under review and a plan for program improvement.

For the purposes of this document, “program” means a course of study which leads to a degree. The Office of Academic Affairs maintains a list of the current academic programs at IU Southeast and is responsible for the scheduling of academic program reviews.

Guiding Principles

1. All programs will be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. In general, a program will be reviewed approximately once every seven years. A review conducted to meet the accreditation requirements of an outside agency will fulfill the requirements of a campus program review so long as it addresses the issues common to all program reviews (see below). The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), in consultation with the deans of the academic units, will establish the schedule for the regular periodic review of programs, taking into account the timing of any external accreditation reviews for campus programs, as well as the timing of the campus’s North Central Association accreditation review.

2. The foundation for a review will be a self-study conducted by the faculty of the program in consultation with the dean of the school. Self-studies must address all the issues common to reviews (see below) and must include an evaluation of program strengths and areas for improvement. Self-studies should be informed by quantitative indicators and by input from all the program’s stakeholders.

3. Every review will make use of one or more external peer reviewer(s) who are mutually agreeable to the faculty, the dean and the VCAA. The reviewer(s) will normally be faculty in the discipline from other universities and, if possible, should be familiar with comparable programs at institutions similar to IU Southeast.

4. Reviews are a collegial undertaking among the faculty of the program, the academic administrators responsible for the program, and the external reviewers. There should be clear, effective, and timely communication among these parties at all stages of the review process.

5. In order to accomplish its purposes as defined above, a review must result in a report which is both informative and evaluative, and which recommends specific changes that will strengthen the program. The review will culminate in an action plan that specifies how the recommended changes will be implemented and a timetable for their implementation.

Issues Addressed by All Reviews

Each program review will be somewhat unique, reflecting the fact that the programs on campus differ from each other in a variety of ways. However, there are certain issues which are common to all programs and which must be addressed by all program reviews at IU Southeast.

1. Mission. The fundamental issue is what roles the program plays in carrying out the mission of the campus. There are several related issues:

- a. Are the mission, purposes, and goals of the program clearly and publicly stated, and are they consistent with the mission, purposes, and goals of the campus?
- b. Is the curriculum of the program consistent with the program's mission, purposes, and goals? Is the curriculum meeting the needs of the students and of the community?
- c. Are the teaching, research, and service activities of the program's faculty consistent with the program's mission, purposes, and goals?

2. Demand and potential demand for the program.

- a. What are the current and recent enrollments in the courses offered by the program? What enrollments are attributable to: program majors; non-majors taking courses required for their major; non-majors taking elective courses? Are there sufficient course offerings for majors; for non-majors? A five year history of enrollments is expected.
- b. What are the current and recent numbers of students majoring in the program? How many potential majors are there in the Academic Success Center? A five year history of the numbers of majors and pre-majors is expected.
- c. What is the recent trend in expressions of interest in the program among prospective students?
- d. Does the program offer unique or distinctive features by comparison with other four-year colleges and universities in Indiana or nearby states?

e. How many graduates has the program had in each of the last five years? How many of these are employed in occupations that are related to their major, or report that their degree is useful in their current employment situation?

3. Quality. The fundamental issue is how effectively the program meets its mission and goals. A basic assumption is that all programs have the potential to be of high quality in the sense that all have the potential to be highly effective in meeting their mission and goals.

An evaluation of program quality must take multiple indicators into account, and these may differ from one program to another. In all cases, the principal indicators of quality must be focused on the student learning outcomes of the curriculum and on the impact of the faculty's research and service efforts. The questions below are those which must be answered by all reviews.

a. What are students in this program learning? It is here that the results of student learning assessment efforts merge into the program review process, by providing the basis for answering the question. All program reviews must include specific reference to data on student learning outcomes and how those data have been used for program improvement.

b. Faculty issues:

1.) Are there sufficient full-time faculty to offer the program? Are teaching assignments appropriate in view of the campus's and the program's missions?

2.) Are adjunct faculty qualified to teach the courses they are assigned and are they being properly utilized?

3.) Are faculty engaged in appropriate professional development activities that support both teaching and research?

4) Are the full-time program faculty actively engaged in appropriate research and creative activities that support and complement their teaching and that contribute to their discipline?

5) Are the full-time program faculty engaged in service activities that support the mission of the program and the campus?

c. Curriculum and instruction issues:

1.) Does the curriculum reflect current trends in the discipline?

2.) Is there adequate evaluation of the quality of instruction?

3.) Are the instructional materials appropriate?

4.) Are modern techniques for instruction being fully utilized in this discipline?

d. Support services issues:

1.) Are there adequate support services for student learning and are these utilized effectively by the students in this program?

2.) Are there adequate support services for teaching and are these utilized effectively by the faculty in this program?

3.) Are there adequate support services for faculty research and creative activity and are these utilized effectively by the program's faculty?

4.) Are there adequate support services for graduates, *e.g.*, placement services, and are these utilized effectively by the graduates of this program?

5.) Are the facilities that are available adequate for the program?

e. Taking all the above into account, is the program stronger than, the same as, or weaker than it was at the time of the last review (or 5-7 years ago if this is the first time the program has been reviewed)? What changes are needed in the next 5-7 years to improve program quality? Recommended changes should be clearly divided into those that might require significant addition of resources and those that can be accomplished with little or no additional resources. If significant resources are required, there should be an indication of the time line for requesting those resources.

Process for conduct of reviews

Program reviews will follow a six-stage process. The stages are listed and described below, along with an indication of the approximate time line for reviews.

1. Notify the program to be reviewed. The VCAA will initiate the review process by sending a letter to the dean of any school which has a program to be reviewed during the upcoming year. The letter will notify the dean of the upcoming review, will indicate the schedule for conduct of the review, and will request that the dean work with faculty of the program to plan the self-study

2. Organize the self-study. The dean and the full-time faculty of the program will develop a plan for the conduct of the self-study. The self-study may be conducted by a committee or it may be conducted by a coordinator who works with the faculty as a whole. If there is a committee, the majority of the members will come from the full-time faculty of the program under review. The dean will present the self-study plan to the VCAA, including the membership of the committee or the name of the coordinator. The VCAA will review the plan and approve it or ask for revisions if deemed appropriate.

3. Conduct the self-study. The self-study process will address the issues listed above as common to all reviews. Additional issues to be addressed may be identified by the faculty, the dean, or the VCAA prior to the beginning of the committee's work or may emerge as the self-study progresses.

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) will support the self-study by coordinating collection of the following data early in the self-study process: enrollments, numbers of majors, personnel, budgets, space use, courses, library resources, and faculty research, including grants sought and received. The committee or coordinator may request additional data as the self-study proceeds and the OAA will assist in attempting to meet such needs.

Once a draft of the self-study report is completed, it will be distributed to the parties to the review for their comments. These comments should focus on the accuracy, completeness, and clarity of the report. The comments will be given to the self-study committee or coordinator for consideration in producing the final version of the report.

4. Conduct external review. The program faculty will suggest the names of potential external reviewer(s). Their suggestions will be evaluated by the dean and the VCAA, who may make or seek additional suggestions. Professional organizations in many disciplines can serve as sources of information on potential reviewers and may be able to provide other forms of assistance as well.

The dean will normally be responsible for arranging the visit of the external reviewer(s). The expenses associated with the visit will be reimbursed by the OAA in accordance with established University policies.

The external reviewer(s) will receive a copy of the self-study documents at least one month prior to the visit to campus. In addition, they will receive a written charge, normally prepared by the dean, which outlines the scope of the review. If they ask for additional information, the OAA will make every effort to meet their needs. It is expected that the campus visit will normally be one-two days long, and that the reviewer(s) will meet with all the parties to the review, as well as with students, faculty and administrators outside the program, and other interested individuals during the visit.

The external reviewer(s) will submit a report to the dean within one month following the campus visit. The report should focus on both the strengths and the areas for improvement of the program and should include specific suggestions for steps to be taken to maintain strengths and to implement program improvements.

5. Prepare action plan. After receiving the external review, the dean and program faculty will prepare a response and a draft plan of action. The draft plan will focus on suggested actions designed to maintain program strengths and implement program improvements.

The dean will send the response to the external review and the draft plan of action to the VCAA, who will convene a meeting of the program faculty and the dean to review and discuss the draft plan. The purpose of this meeting will be to reach agreement on the issues and actions which will be included in the final plan. The action plan should clearly distinguish between recommendations that have budgetary implications and those that do not require additional funding. Once agreement is reached on all the key issues, the dean and program faculty will prepare the final version of the action plan for distribution to the parties to the review, including the external reviewer(s). The plan will be marked as the final version and dated.

6. Implement the action plan. Primary responsibility for implementing the final action plan rests with the program faculty and the dean. The program faculty will give priority to those actions recommended in the plan as they engage in their ongoing operational and planning processes. Deans will take into account the recommendations in the plan when they formulate school plans, annual unit goals, and budget requests. The VCAA will take into account the recommendations of program reviews in the formulation of campus-wide academic goals and budget requests.

Suggested Time Line for Program Reviews

Dates	Actions	Responsibility
March 1	Notify dean of schedule program review	OAA
March-April	Organize self-study process	Dean and faculty
May 1	Review and approve self-study process	VCAA
May-June	Provide basic support data to program	OIRA, OAA
	Suggest additional topics for inclusion in the self-study	Faculty, dean, VCAA
October 1	Identify external reviewer(s)	Dean, faculty, VCAA
December 1	Submit self-study to dean and VCAA	Faculty
January 1	Dean and VCAA comment on self study	Dean, VCAA
January 30	Final version of self-study completed	Faculty
February 1	Send self-study to external reviewer(s)	Dean
March 1	Campus visit of external reviewer(s)	Dean
April 1	Receive external reviewer's report	External reviewer
May 1	Draft action plan to VCAA	Faculty and dean
May	Meet to discuss draft action plan	VCAA, dean, faculty
June 1	Final action plan completed	Dean

Sources/references

“Indiana University Procedures for Program Reviews.”
Indiana University Faculty Council Circular U33-93, April 13, 1993

“Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs” Office of Academic Affairs, IP
Fort Wayne, 2006.

“Indiana University South Bend Procedures for Program Review.” Office of
Academic Affairs, IU South Bend, 2007.

Endorsed by IU Southeast Faculty Senate March 20, 2008

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS

by action of University Faculty Council (April 13, 1993)

The Educational Policies Committee has slightly revised and endorsed the following procedures for program review that were initially formulated by the Academic Cabinet. The purpose of the recommendations is to regularize the process of program review throughout the system while at the same time leaving to each unit sufficient latitude to define the parameters of the review in the light of its own particular mission. Accordingly, the EPC recommends:

1. that Indiana University implements a campus-based system of regular periodic (once every 5-7 years) program reviews of individual departments and schools;*
2. that the reviews be conducted by the chancellor or dean (for large units);
3. that the reviews make use of outside peer reviewers who are mutually agreeable to faculty of the unit and the dean or chancellor;
4. that the faculty of the unit under review prepare a mission statement for the unit and a statement of goals to be used by the appointing officer in charging the Outside reviewers;
5. that there be within one year a follow-up to the report of the outside reviewers indicating the steps taken to address the report, with copies to the outside reviewers;
6. that all reviews address certain essential questions:
 - a) What are the students learning? Is the curriculum of the unit consistent with the unit's mission?
 - b) Are the teaching, research, and service activities of the faculty consistent with the unit's mission?
 - c) Is the unit better than, the same as, or worse than it was five (seven) years ago?
 - d) What changes are needed in the next five (seven) years?
7. that the unit under review and the outside reviewers have support services to provide certain items of information useful in assessing progress, such as the number of graduates, retention, external grants and contracts, the diversity of the faculty and student body;

8. that each chancellor and dean submit to the Chair of the Academic Cabinet at the end of each year a list of programs that were reviewed that year.

*Regular accrediting and professional organization review may serve this purpose.

Goals for Program Reviews

Adding to the UFC circular U33-93:

Faculty:

- a) Are there sufficient resident faculty to offer the program?
- b) Are adjunct faculty being properly utilized?
- c) Is there sufficient Professional Development for faculty?
- d) Are teaching assignments reasonable considering the mission of the discipline and the expectations for promotion and tenure?
- e) Are faculty involved in co-curricular activities?

Curriculum

- a) Does the curriculum need to be modified?
- b) Does the curriculum reflect current trends in this discipline?
- c) Are there sufficient courses (and sections) for majors?
- d) Are there sufficient course (and sections) for non-majors?
- e) Are the students' needs being met by the current curriculum?
- f) Are the community's needs being met by the current curriculum?

Instruction

- a) Is instruction being adequately evaluated?
- b) Are the instructors qualified to teach the courses they are assigned?
- c) Are materials being used for instruction appropriate?
- d) Are modern techniques for instruction being fully utilized in this discipline?

e) Do students have access to instructor outside of class?

Support Services

a) Are there adequate support services for student learning; e.g.: study areas, tutors, copy machines, library resources, and computer resources?

b) Are there adequate support services for teaching: audio-visual equipment, etc.?

c) Are there adequate support services for research; e.g.: equipment, library support, and grant writing, etc.?

d) Are there support services for graduates; e.g.: career planning and placement, advanced courses, etc.?

e) Is the physical plant adequate for the program.