

POLICY ON PERIODIC UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Approved by Undergraduate Council 3/31/2008; by Academic Council 5/6/2008

Approved by Provost 6/17/08

Introduction

Periodic academic program reviews of all programs are an expectation of SACS and of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and they provide the institution with important information about the status of academic programs and their needs.

The main objective of periodic program reviews is to provide a mechanism for improving the quality of undergraduate programs at Texas Woman's University. Periodic program reviews give faculty and academic leaders important information about the effectiveness of a program including its strengths, weaknesses, and contribution to the mission of the university. In addition, information about the efficiency of programs is provided. Results of program reviews are used to give direction, to set goals for the future, and to ensure that general academic plans and budget decisions are based on information and priorities which match closely those of the university. Information gathered in these reviews will be incorporated in the next SACS self-study. TWU will begin this process in the academic year with a five year review cycle. The schedule for review is listed in Appendix A.

Accredited programs may use their accreditation self-studies and reports to replace the TWU review process described here (if they include assessment of student learning outcomes). A copy of the narrative of the self-study should be sent to the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research with copy of the accreditation review, recommendations and actions reports. (Electronic copies are preferred.)

General Procedures

Notification of Department Review: About one year in advance of the review, the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will notify the head of the academic unit and the academic dean of the college that a review has been scheduled. During the spring semester prior to the academic year during which the academic unit is to be reviewed, the chair of the academic unit will meet with the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies who will explain the review process and establish a timetable. A timeline for the review with internal review only is shown in Appendix B.1 Consistent with the guidelines for selecting members of the review committee (p. 3), the chair will be asked to begin making a list of names of faculty members who can serve as internal review committee members for the departmental review. The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, in consultation with the chair and academic dean, will request committee member service.

Gathering Preliminary Information: The department/school will gather internal information with assistance from the Office of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Finance and Administration, Institutional Development, and the office of the dean of the academic unit to be reviewed. Each academic unit head will begin to gather evidence of effectiveness during the spring prior to the academic year during which the academic unit is to be reviewed. Refer to the list of data to be gathered in Appendix E. Central coordination of institutional level data is planned so that all units to be reviewed in the next academic year will have data gathered centrally at the same time, in the same manner, and from the

same sources. Departments will need to gather department-level data which is not available from central databases. A department may also gather information from peer institutions as a part of their review.

Preparation of Self-study: The self-study document should follow the format shown in Appendix C. The chair and/or program director of the academic unit being reviewed is ultimately responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the self-study. The chair may designate another faculty member or a team of faculty members to carry out the self-study, but should be continually and actively involved in overseeing the preparation of the self-study. All full-time faculty members should be involved in the preparation of the self-study. The participation of enrolled students, alumni, and professional staff is highly encouraged. The self-study should be evaluative rather than simply descriptive. It should be more than just a collection of data, but rather an analysis of data and an academic judgment about the effectiveness of the program, students' curriculum, resources, and future directions of the academic unit. The self-study should be one that assesses the academic unit's effectiveness in reaching goals, strengths, areas needing work, and actions needed both immediately and long-term.

Selection of Review Committee Members: Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will select a three-member internal review committee in consultation with the academic chair and dean of the academic unit being reviewed. Committee members must be full-time faculty members. Internal review committee members cannot be from the department to be reviewed, and no more than two can be from another department in the same college/school. The other committee member should be from departments outside the college/school. The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will request their service in the fall semester of the academic year during which the academic unit will be reviewed.

Submission of Self-Study: The self-study should be forwarded (either electronically or as a hard copy) to the Office of Undergraduate Studies no later than the second week in February of the academic year during which the academic unit is being reviewed. The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will review the self-study document for content, completeness, and accuracy, and, if necessary, request that revisions be made by the department. The Office of Undergraduate Studies will forward one copy of the self-study to the dean of the college, one copy to the Provost, and a copy to each member of the review committee.

The Review Process: The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will meet with the review committee members during the third week of February of the academic year during which the academic unit is being reviewed. At this meeting, a committee chair will be elected from the three-member review committee, and instructions and advice on the review process will be given. Within thirty (30) days of this initial meeting, the review committee will submit its report to the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Guidelines for the reviewers are detailed in Appendix D. When resources permit, external reviews are recommended to complete a review of the self-study.

Assessment of Report: The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will schedule a meeting no later than two weeks after receiving the report of the committee. Attendance at this meeting will consist of the chair of the academic unit, the dean of the college of the academic unit, the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, the chair of the review committee, and any other faculty selected by the department chair. A summary of the review will be presented by the chair of the review committee. At this meeting, the chair will be given the opportunity to respond to the report of

the review committee and to add any relevant information. After a brief statement by the dean of the college, a discussion will follow. The time allotted for the meeting will be approximately 45 minutes.

Action of the Dean: After consultation with the Provost, the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies and the program director or chair, the supervising dean will submit a brief statement outlining the follow-up steps to be taken based on the outcome of the review. This statement should be issued within fifteen days after this meeting, with copies distributed to the department, college, Office of Undergraduate Studies, and to the Provost.

Follow Up and Progress Report: Approximately one year after the completion of the review of a department or program, there will be a meeting with the chair or program director, the college dean, and Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies. Prior to the meeting, a written progress report from the component should be sent to the supervising dean which outlines the follow-up steps taken and the outcomes of those steps.

Appendix A: Schedule for Review of Undergraduate Programs

NOTE: Self-studies completed by programs for accreditation by external accrediting agencies will be used for undergraduate program reviews if they include assessment of student learning outcomes.

Academic Year	Department	
2008-2009	Nutrition & Food Sciences B.S. Food & Nutrition in Business and Industry B.S. Nutrition	
	Family Sciences B.S. Child Development B.S. FCS B.S. Family Studies	
	School of Management B.B.A.	
	School of Management B.S. Fashion Merchandising B.A. Fashion Design	
	ACCREDITED B.S. Dietetics and Inst. Administration	
	2009-2010	Teacher Education
		Sociology & Criminal Justice B.A./B.S. Sociology B.A./B.S. Criminal Justice
		Math & Computer Science B.A./B.S. Mathematics B.S. Computer Science
		ACCREDITED B.S. Nursing B.S.W. Social Work
		2010-2011
Chemistry B.S. Chemistry		
Drama B.A. Drama		
Visual Arts B.A. Art B.F.A. Art		
Kinesiology B.S. Kinesiology		
English B.A. English		
ACCREDITED B.A. Dance; B.A. Dance (teacher certification) B.S. Health Studies B.A. Music and Music Therapy		
2011-2012	Psychology B.A./B.S. Psychology	
	General Studies B.G.S. General Studies	
	History & Government B.A./B.S. Government B.A./B.S. History	
	ACCREDITED B.S. Communication Sciences B.S. Dental Hygiene	

Appendix B: Time Line for Reviews

One year in advance of the review:

The head of the academic unit and the academic dean of that college are notified by the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies - that a review has been scheduled. The offices of Institutional Research and other administrative offices from which data are needed will be given a list of data needs and programs to be reviewed.

Spring semester prior to the review:

The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies - will meet with the head of the academic unit and the supervising dean to explain the review process, establish a timetable for data collection, and preview data collection procedures. The offices of Institutional Research and other administrative offices from which data are needed will be contacted again to schedule data reports and answer any questions about data collection.

Summer prior to the review:

The head of the academic unit, in collaboration with other offices in the university, will begin to collect data on the unit representing the last 5 years of activity. The offices of Institutional Research and other administrative offices will prepare data reports.

Fall semester during review year:

Preparation of the self-study document will begin.
A three-member internal review committee will be selected.

Second week of February during review year:

Deadline for one copy of the self-study to be forwarded to Undergraduate Studies.

Third week of February during review year:

The self study will be submitted to the review committee. The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will meet with the members of the review committee to provide instructions and advice on the review process.

Last week of Feb. – mid-March: Department receives report and makes any corrections of factual errors.

By the second week of April:

The head of the academic unit being reviewed and the dean of that college will meet with the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, the chair of the review committee, and others as appropriate to discuss the report.

By the end of April:

The dean of the unit being reviewed will submit a statement outlining follow-up steps to be taken based on the program review.

One year after completion of program review: The head of the academic unit and the dean of the college will meet with the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies to discuss the outcome of the follow-up.

Appendix C

Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Self-Study

Note: Include tables and charts as appropriate along with discussion of each item.

I. Program Overview and Mission

Include a one to two-page summary of department's mission and organization, paying special attention to enrollment goals, program scope and size. Describe the functional relationship between the undergraduate degree program(s) and other instructional programs in the unit. Provide an overview of the human, material, and fiscal resources available to support these programs. Provide general descriptions of the institutional effectiveness plan and of progress made on the unit's strategic plan in relation to the college and TWU strategic plan.

II. Institutional Effectiveness – Student Learning Outcomes

For each undergraduate degree program, present a statement of purpose and measurable student learning outcomes related to the program's purpose. Each program must have a record of measuring and monitoring achievement of student learning outcomes. Provide evidence that students have achieved the learning outcomes set by the program. The record should demonstrate that the department/ program is engaged in a regular cycle of (1) measurement of students' achievement of program goals, (2) analysis of strengths and weaknesses, (3) implementation of changes and improvements based on analysis, and (4) follow-up of the impact of changes and improvements. Describe how the program is monitoring and measuring efforts designed to result in program improvements. Provide a summary analysis of the evidence, identify strengths, and suggest possible actions to be taken to strengthen the program.

III. Curriculum and Programs of Study

Describe the curriculum offerings, areas of specialization, service courses, and program options, including distance course or program delivery. Factors that should be considered are degree requirements, alignment of degree requirements with student learning outcomes, course offerings, frequency, curriculum updates and connection of curriculum with current developments in the discipline, and mechanisms which foster independent learning. The program should be compared with similar programs elsewhere.

Evaluate curricula and degree programs after consideration of the following:

- A. Alignment of courses with student learning goals
- B. Alignment of courses with current developments in the field
- C. Upper division course offerings, enrollments, and delivery modes over the past five years (with course rotations if possible)
- D. Special course offerings (with travel, other), internships
- E. Active learning practices and strategies for engagement in learning activities
- D. Undergraduate, masters, and doctoral semester credit hour production by area/ concentration and service (core) courses or courses in interdisciplinary programs.
- F. Average total credit hours per degree
- G. Number of majors in the program for the past five fall semesters
- H. Number, levels, and types of degrees awarded over the past five years.

Provide a summary analysis, identify strengths, and suggest possible actions to be taken to strengthen the program.

IV. Quality and Quantity of Students and Graduates

Describe the undergraduate students and the existence of policies and practices in support of their success. Factors to be considered are student demographic profile, student recruitment, student retention and graduation. To the extent possible provide post-graduation success information: placement of graduates, career success of former students, and students pursuing graduate studies. Information about advisory boards, if applicable, should be provided. Evaluate the success of students in completing degree programs considering the following:

- A. Demographics of enrolled students
- B. Test scores on standardized (major field or other) tests of students who complete the program
- C. GPAs of graduates
- D. Department efforts to advise and to retain students
- E. Preparation of students for online learning (if applicable)
- F. Summary of student involvement in organizations related to the profession
- G. Retention and graduation rates of students
- H. Student/Faculty contact opportunities beyond class (frequency, type, etc.)
- I. Employment of graduates and graduate pursuing graduate studies over the past five years (when available)

Provide a summary analysis, identify strengths, and suggest possible actions to be taken to strengthen the program.

V. Faculty Resources and Productivity

Describe faculty resources and productivity. Factors to be considered are faculty profile, faculty scholarship and awards, faculty teaching load, and faculty service. Evaluate the contribution of the faculty to the program after considering the following:

- A. Rank and demographics of the faculty and professional staff (including full-time, part-time faculty, and graduate teaching assistants)
- B. Summary of the number of refereed publications and creative activities. (Provide citations as an appendix.)
- C. Responsibilities and involvement in professional societies
- D. Faculty workload and teaching productivity (use discipline appropriate criteria to determine)
- E. Faculty development activities for full and part-time faculty
- F. Faculty preparation for online instruction (if applicable)

Provide a summary analysis, identify strengths, and suggest possible actions to be taken to strengthen the program.

VI. Departmental Efficiency, Effectiveness, Facilities and Resources

Describe available resources and evaluate the effectiveness of the use of those resources: the adequacy of staff support, physical facilities, library resources, equipment, research facilities, information technology, and the program budget. Review the administrative effectiveness and efficiency of the department after consideration of the following:

- A. External and internal grants and contracts awarded
- B. Source and amount of grants and pending grants
- C. Success rate of grant applications
- D. Research expenditures

- E. Departmental scholarships and endowments
- G. Departmental resources for research and teaching (i.e. classroom space, lab facilities, re-assigned time)
- H. HEAF expenditures

Provide a summary analysis, identify strengths, and suggest possible actions to be taken to strengthen the program.

VII. Summary of Analyses – Describe the overall quality and direction of the program. Based on the analysis of data in each section, provide a two- to three-page summary of the observed strengths and areas needing improvement identified by the program review. Highlight significant contributions to the university mission. Include reflections on the effectiveness of the program and match of resources to departmental work in undergraduate education. Include a prioritized list of program needs and actions to be taken over the next five years. Discuss whether accreditation is available, whether the programs have applied for accreditation, and, if so, the outcome of the application.

VIII. Appendices – should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- A. Course offerings and enrollment trends
- B. Recruiting materials – include departmental brochure, web address for prospective students
- C. Academic Program Student Handbook (if available)
- D. Faculty review - Provide table on faculty rank, tenure status, and faculty productivity
- E. Description and information about Student Association(s)
- F. Description and information about Program Advisory Boards (if applicable)

Appendix D

The Task of the Reviewers

The review committee is encouraged to focus attention on questions regarding the relationship of programs to the goals of the university. It is the task of the reviewers to single out those features of the program that merit special commendation, and to make recommendations where there is room for improvement. Reviewers should formulate their evaluations not only from the self-study document, but also from interviews with the unit chairperson, faculty members, and students.

The task of the reviewers is to formulate objective judgments of the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate programs. The evaluation is concerned with quality of program design, mastery of student learning outcomes, student academic success, and administrative effectiveness. The following are important considerations:

- The overall quality and direction of the program
- The quality of faculty and professional staff
- The quality of students and supportive policies and practices
- The quality of curriculum offerings and program options
- The adequacy of resources for the program.

The Executive Report: The findings and recommendations of the committee should take the format of a concise one to two-page executive summary. Overall observations, strengths/ commendations, deficiencies/ recommendations, and value of the program to the mission of the university should be included in this report. Specific recommendations should be made regarding what is needed to strengthen programs that have deficiencies, or perhaps what is needed to lift an outstanding program to the top of its discipline. Specific recommendations should also be made for each program in the event that additional resources are not available.

Reviewers should rate the program under review and provide a graded assessment as one of the following:

- Commendable
- Satisfactory
- Less than satisfactory

Guidance for Reviewers

During the review of each academic unit, reviewers are encouraged to evaluate the academic unit with respect to the areas listed below. Reviewers are encouraged to provide ratings of “less than satisfactory,” “satisfactory,” or “commendable” for each of the six areas below. Ratings of commendable should be reserved for areas of exceptional merit. Reviewers should not feel confined to the areas specified and can examine and comment on other areas that they deem important to the review process.

I. Program Overview and Mission

Evaluate the mission and organization of the academic unit, paying special attention to program enrollment planning, goals, and program size.

II. Institutional Effectiveness - Student Learning Outcomes

Examine the program's evidence that students achieve the learning outcomes set by the program, as well as how it is monitoring and measuring efforts intended to result in program improvements.

III. Curriculum and Programs of Study

Evaluate the curriculum and programs of study. Factors that should be considered are degree requirements, alignment of degree requirements with student learning outcomes, course offerings, frequency, areas of specialization, connection of curriculum with current developments in the discipline, and mechanisms which foster independent learning enabling the graduate to contribute to the profession and field of study. Reviewers should consider the department's comparison of the program with similar programs elsewhere.

IV. Quality and Quantity of Students and Graduates

Evaluate the quality and quantity of students and graduates. Factors to be considered are student profile, student recruitment, student retention, placement of graduates, career success of former students, students pursuing graduate studies.

V. Faculty Resources and Productivity

Evaluate faculty resources and productivity. Factors to be considered are faculty profile, faculty scholarship and awards, faculty teaching load, and faculty service.

VI. Departmental Efficiency, Effectiveness, Facilities, and Resources

Determine if existing space, library resources, information technology, and support staff are adequate to support the program.

APPENDIX E. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW DATA	
Type of Quantitative Data – for the past five years*	Source
Department Information	
Number and level of degrees awarded** (IER data does not include concentrations, certifications, tracks)	Institutional Effectiveness & Research (IER)
Semester credit hour production** (fall semesters)	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Student Information	
Average time to degree for students	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Average GPA for graduates	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
The number of majors in the department for fall semesters (headcount)**	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Number (headcount) and demographics of enrolled students (gender, ethnicity, age, admission status; SCH transferred to TWU)	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Number of students with excess hours compared to number of majors in the unit	Undergraduate Studies
Average total hours per undergraduate degrees granted	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Average retention and graduation rates	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Test scores of students and applicants on standardized or local common exams (most recent available data)	Component data and/or Institutional Effectiveness
Faculty Information	
The number of full and part-time faculty by rank and demographics	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Student to Faculty Ratio**	Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Research activities; refereed publications and creative activities of faculty and program students; external and internal grants and contracts awarded by funding source	Component data
Work by faculty in professional societies	Component data
Faculty workload including teaching productivity (students taught, classes taught, etc.) and other work documented on workload reports	Academic Financial Services
Faculty advising: number of students per advisor	Component data

*Departments and IER will use the most recent available data in most cases; for enrollment and SCH, fall semester data will be used by IER.

** Data currently reported on Academic Program Review data on Institutional Effectiveness & Research website.

Information for Departments to Gather for Academic Program Reviews

Types of Information	Examples
Direct student learning outcome assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Capstone course evaluation (for all students in the program) -Course-embedded assessment (for all students in the program) -Tests and examinations (local, state, or nationally standardized) -Portfolio evaluation (of all graduates by group of faculty) -Electronic record of performance evaluation (of all graduates) -Pre-test/Post-test evaluation (all majors/graduates) -Evaluations of student performances or research/ capstone projects
Indirect indicators of student learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Internship evaluations -Student surveys and exit interviews -Alumni surveys -Curriculum and syllabi analysis -Placement of graduates -Student GPAs
Faculty research activities	Refereed publications and creative activities of faculty and program students; external and internal grants and contracts awarded by funding source; other research activities.
Faculty professional service	External work by faculty in professional societies; reviewing for journals; serving as peer reviewers; etc. and internal service
Departmental mission and program learning outcomes	Matching institutional effectiveness learning outcomes; alignment of courses with learning outcomes (curriculum map)
Description of departmental institutional effectiveness activities.	
Description of departmental special courses and their enrollment	Courses with travel; internships; service learning; experiential learning.
Departmental activities for majors	Honor societies, meetings for majors, etc.
Departmental advising plan	Advising model; types of students enrolled – special populations; number of students per advisor; advisor training; etc.
Alumni and/or employment surveys	Satisfaction with program; earnings; percentage working in the field of the degree
Departmental financial resources and expenditures	Operating budgets, grants, HEAF, “Friends Accounts”
Departmental Advisory Boards	Meeting frequency, activities, recommendations of board
Curriculum information	Current curriculum inventory; addition of new courses to update curriculum; course rotation; courses taught online/ at a distance or on non-traditional hours; course syllabi demonstrating inclusion and assessment of learning outcomes
Written guidelines for students	Student handbooks, web page, brochures

*Departments and IER will use the most recent available data in most cases; for enrollment and SCH, fall semester data will be used by IER.

** Data currently reported on Academic Program Review data on Institutional Effectiveness & Research website.