



ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

MANUAL¹

APPROVED BY ACADEMIC DEANS COUNCIL

November 12, 2019

A PUBLICATION OF EAST TEXAS BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND EFFECTIVENESS

¹Grateful to Matthew Bronson with SPOL for providing source document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | RATIONALE AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES | 3 |
| | Why do we do Program Review? | |
| | Program Review and Accreditation | |
| II. | OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS | 4 |
| | Faculty Responsibilities | |
| | OIRE Responsibilities | |
| | Tips for the Program Review Process | |
| | Continuous Improvement of Program Review | |
| III. | PLANNING AND PREPARATION | 5 |
| | Faculty Involvement | |
| | Timeline for Program Review | |
| | Post-Program Review: Ongoing Reporting and Next Review | |
| IV. | CONDUCTING THE SELF-STUDY AND CRITERIA FOR REVIEW | 7 |
| | Checklist for the Program Review Report | |
| | Instructions for Report Sections: Criteria for Review | |
| V. | DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN | 14 |
| VI. | APPENDICES | 15 |

I. RATIONALE & GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Why do we do Program Review?

The primary purpose of the review process is to enhance academic quality and student learning through inquiry, analysis, and reflection. It is standard in higher education to require academic review in the expectation that engaging in this process allows programs to maintain standards and rigor, improve, and more effectively plan for the future.

Periodic review allows staff and faculty to focus time and attention on big-picture and systemic issues. Using all available evidence, they reflect on their mission and the design of the curriculum in which it is realized. Useful program reviews assess the impact on students, the academic community, and society, and inform planning and improvement moving forward.

Such reflection is undertaken within the program and is overseen and supported by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Dean of Academic Services and Institutional Research (DASIR), other academic Deans and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) at East Texas Baptist University (ETBU). These individuals act on behalf of and in consultation with faculty to coordinate the necessary work with the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE).

The program's review is meant to provide an opportunity to clarify, evaluate, and revise, as needed, the program's vision, mission, learning outcomes, assessments, and curriculum. This is also an opportunity to clarify what resources are needed and/or need to be modified, given the trajectory of the program and its place in realizing the University's mission.

In a spirit of "appreciative inquiry," it is important to highlight areas of strength along with considering genuine opportunities for improvement. Within the self-study and program review process, academic units are asked to make explicit their understanding of desired outcomes and to actively reflect upon their practices so as to more deeply understand how and how well their programs are achieving the stated goals. They also are asked to articulate the program's particular contributions and emphases within academia and connection to ETBU's values and aspirations as a community.

Regular program review is a necessary part of life in an academic institution. In a world in constant flux, programs must adapt and change to stay viable as they respond to shifts in student demographics, academia, and their discipline(s). It is an ethical and practical necessity to routinely make the implicit explicit, rendering transparent what otherwise might remain a matter of unarticulated, and unquestioned, habit or custom. The inquiry required by this review has among its aims fostering a common culture of reflection, learning, and accountability at ETBU. The institution engages all faculty members in such processes as appropriate faculty development, assessment, and program review. All core faculty are expected by the University to participate fully as part of their regular service duties. Adjuncts should also be involved to the fullest extent possible.

Genuine improvement is possible only when programs talk openly about the challenges they face so that others can provide insight and support. Identifying improvement and participating in a dialogical process is the cornerstone of creating a dynamic learning community and enhancing academic rigor.

The imperative to review programs is non-negotiable as required by accreditors and the institution's obligations to the various stakeholders directly and indirectly connected to the learning community. However, the means by which the ETBU community designs and implements this process and the values used to guide it are its own.

Program Review and Accreditation

Program Review is not an exercise purely for the benefit of ETBU internally. Our survival and standing as an institution of higher learning depend on a sustained attention to assessment through each cycle of accreditation. ETBU is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). A major focus of every SACSCOC review will be on how well each program has incorporated systematic review of student work into their routine operations and how they are "closing the loop" by identifying changes in practice or curriculum to improve learning based on what they are finding. The quality and timeliness of the program review process is currently a critical concern for all national and regional accreditors.

The guidelines that govern the accreditation process require ETBU to document how it puts into practice an academic culture that is dedicated to institutional learning and improvement. All programs are required to have systems in place for assessing student learning on an ongoing basis (in the annual Effectiveness Plans).

The program review process needs to build and document routine inquiry and analysis of progress toward stated goals into the operations of the program. The process is designed to be more than a once-every-five-years exercise. The overarching goal is to embed a culture of reflection and accountability into the ways programs think about and do their everyday work.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

There are five parts to the program review process: (1) planning and preparation, (2) the self-study, (3) the strategic plan, (4) the report, and (5) Dean and VPAA review.

Faculty Responsibilities

The main tasks of the faculty in the program are to:

- design and implement a review that assesses the program and student learning,
- prepare a program review document, and
- participate in the drafting of a strategic plan that will guide future action.

This process needs to be tightly planned and managed to minimize the stress and maximize the value for all concerned.

DASIR Responsibilities

The Dean of Academic Services and Institutional Research (DASIR) will be your main point of contact to get the support you need to deal with challenges, and to keep the process flowing smoothly. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will facilitate your progress from the first meeting through the strategic plan. The DASIR will help develop an internal timeline and a process for completion of the components of the report. (See Appendix A for a sample timeline.) He/she has the responsibility of finding and providing the data sets that you will need to complete each section where these are not already available to the program.

Tips for the Program Review Process

- Consider holding a retreat or other in-depth discussion among all faculty about program direction, priorities, and needs. Consider using a facilitator from outside the program; this can often improve the effectiveness of these meetings and increase participation from all parties.
- Divide the workload. This review should reflect input of all program faculty. Consider using a secure cloud-based drive, the ETBU shared drive, or other file sharing methods to facilitate collaboration. However, when collaborating, the final document should be reviewed for cohesiveness.
- Encourage transparency. Engage related departments or administrative units. Involve students, staff, and alumni.
- Be concise and objective. Reports that speak only to strengths are easy to dismiss as public relations. Use this opportunity to reflect objectively and identify areas where attention should be paid. Focus on the main points and stay on track with page limits.
- Seek advice. Use OIRE as a resource to answer questions and provide consultation and guidance.
- Plan ahead. This is a valuable opportunity to take a close look at ways to improve your program and ensure it remains relevant and strong in a rapidly changing environment. Don't wait until the last minute to write the report.

Continuous Improvement of Program Review

The aim in program review is for all stakeholders to get the most out of the significant time and effort required in the inquiry. In a spirit of continuous improvement, the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee invite your suggestions for how to accomplish this goal better. The details of the major parts of the program review process are provided below along with recommendations on how to proceed at each stage.

III. PLANNING AND PREPARATION

The established schedule for program review has all programs undergoing review within a five-year cycle. All reviews are expected to be underway in fall semester of the

designated academic year. It is important to note that the schedule for program reviews is set, in many cases, by department rather than by program. It should be noted that all references to “program” within this document are meant to indicate specific majors. If a particular department has several majors, then the program review must address each program (major) individually rather than addressing the department as a whole.

In the spring of the academic year preceding the official start of the review period, the DASIR will schedule a meeting to orient the Chairs and faculty of programs who are to begin a review in the following semester. It is recommended that the Chair bring other faculty and staff to the orientation meeting. The DASIR provides direction and support to keep the review on track.

In advance of the initial meeting, copies of the academic program review manual are distributed along with a data packet produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (Appendix B). At the meeting, review processes and timelines are discussed as are specific issues or questions identified by the DASIR, the Dean, and/or the VPAA stemming from the data or the strategic plan resulting from the last program review. The program faculty may ask their questions and speak to their early plans for the review.

Faculty Involvement

The program is advised to begin planning the review process during that spring (semester 0). All core faculty members and as many adjuncts as is feasible should be involved in the self-study and have an opportunity to contribute to the content and analysis in a meaningful way. As student input must also be included, the program should plan how it is going to gather data from students (e.g., surveys or focus groups) and perhaps from alumni.

A part of every faculty meeting during the review period will need to be devoted to progress reports and special meetings will likely need to be held to accomplish some of the work.

The culmination of the self-study portion of program review involves “closing the loop” into a plan of action to address the issues that have emerged from the review. This phase of inquiry is easily neglected in the press of delivering a report, but it is a critical moment for programs to distill the key findings and associated improvements. The process of collective reflection in which the project has been launched and sustained should now converge on a set of specific action items and recommendations (such as requests for resources). These points will inform the strategic plan drafting phases.

Timeline for Program Review

Semester 0 – Spring-Summer

- The DASIR notifies Program Chair and/or Dean of pending program review and invites Program Chair, core faculty and staff to attend an orientation meeting

facilitated by the DASIR.

- The DASIR provides program with list of additional issues to be covered in the review based on previous reviews and current conditions at ETBU and in the program.
- Program Chair and core faculty with DASIR create plan for completing review and design instruments for gathering data. Outstanding questions are resolved about how to proceed with the review.
- Surveys, focus groups, other research initiated under DASIR's direction.

Semester 1 - Fall

- Review curriculum in light of student learning outcomes and institutional commitments.
- Complete survey or student focus groups.
- Aggregate and review results of student learning assessments.
- Review curriculum in light of findings.
- Address program specific issues identified so far by stakeholders.
- Consider progress in completing the strategic plan from the previous review.

Semester 2 - Spring

- Draft the program review report.
- Submit the program review report to the DASIR by March 1st.
- DASIR reviews report and either accepts or asks for revisions.
- Formal review and acceptance by Deans Council; DASIR forwards the report to VPAA.

Post-Program Review: Ongoing Reporting and Next Review

The Program Chair provides an update to the DASIR in writing by the end of each spring semester as part of the annual Effectiveness Plan on key points as determined in the strategic plan. The DASIR, Dean, and the VPAA work with the Program Chair between reviews to assess progress toward the program's commitments expressed in the strategic plan and provide institutional support as available.

The program review process will begin again in the fifth academic year after the program review was started. The date of the next planned review will be included in the strategic plan.

IV. CONDUCTING THE SELF-STUDY AND CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

Why do program reviews? They are an opportunity to highlight what is important in the work of your department and the university and to identify strengths and opportunities for improvement.

The Program Chair will receive current Fact Book information from the Office of

Institutional Research and Effectiveness in Semester 0 and should provide these data to the program faculty along with a copy of the report and strategic plan from the last review. The DASIR, the Dean and the VPAA may also provide a list of issues to focus on.

In the planning stage, the DASIR will help you design a focused inquiry on a few key aspects of operations, while addressing all the essential components of the review. In each section, provide a (succinct) view of the trajectory of the issue (past, present, future projection) so that the reader will understand the motivation for your final recommendations.

It will be essential to create a plan and timeline so that the report and associated documentation can be delivered on time in a well-edited and professional presentation. Someone will have to take the lead in drafting but the process should be as collaborative as possible to claim its full value. Please use the rare opportunity of focused attention to build your program's capacity for ongoing reflection during the research and writing phases. Interim drafts of sections should certainly be circulated to keep the process alive and sustain the momentum toward completion.

The report should be written with several audiences in mind: yourselves as a program, your colleagues and administrators at ETBU, your peers, and the professional communities of which you are members. Your formal submission will also be permanently archived, provided to colleagues as a model, and will be reviewed in detail by SACSCOC during the accreditation process.

For optimum usability, reports should aim for 30, but not exceed a maximum of 40 pages. Use tables and diagrams to convey key information where possible. Please include in your introduction and supporting materials sufficient detail and history for an external reviewer to make sense of your narrative. It is expected that you will provide a professional report that stands on its own and is worthy of review by your peers.

The following sections should be included for degree-granting programs. Please consult the DASIR for questions as to the applicability and detailed criteria for each item.

Checklist for the Program Review Report

1. Cover Sheet (signed by participating faculty members, Chair, and Dean).
2. Table of Contents (1-2 pages): please give page numbers and sub-sections.
3. Introduction and Executive Summary (2 pages).
4. Review of Program Mission Statement (for each program/major) and Proposed Revisions (2 pages).
5. Discussion of Current Context for the Program (3-5 pages).

- __6. Progress in Completing Previous Strategic Plan (2 pages).
- __7. Curricular Map and Student Learning Outcomes (3 pages).
- __8. Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (2-3 pages).
- __9. Marketability, Recruitment, Retention, Graduation (2-5 pages).
- __10. Program Leadership and Faculty (2 pages).
- __11. Resources and Facilities (1-2 pages).
- __12. Future Trajectory of the Program (3 pages).
- __13. Changes to be Made and Strategic Plan Points (2 pages).
- __14. Appendices. At a minimum, provide any program handbook or documentation provided to students.

Instructions for Report Sections: Criteria for Review

Introduction and Executive Summary

Provide a brief history of the program and a clear explanation of the process by which the report was drafted (who met, how many times, what actions they took, etc.) and the data-collection and analysis activities undertaken. Describe how students and adjunct faculty were involved in the self-study and if other constituencies participated (e.g., alumni, community members) and give an overview of the report and its contents.

Mission Statement (for each program rather than department)

Program faculty should meet to reflect on the current mission statement and develop a revised one, if needed, with the goal of having a mission statement that will hold the program over the next five years. The revision process is a way to articulate commitments and concerns along with a vision for the program's lofty aspirations and long-term goals. The discussion may be iterative as you return to this section in light of what you are learning during the review. In discussing the vision and mission statement, consider the following:

1. How well does the statement reflect what you are doing now and what you hope to do? Include in your narrative a brief history of how this has evolved over time.
2. What concerns, commitments, capacities, and hopes do you bring to the program through your work as teachers, researchers, and community members? How well are these reflected in the statement? How should it be amended to reflect who you are now?
3. What do you understand to be working well in your program? What are your strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats? (SWOT, see Appendix C).

4. What is your program's aspiration as a community-of-practice and learning community?
5. What are you preparing students to do in the world after graduation?

A second part of this section of the report should articulate how your program's mission and vision align with the University's mission, institutional learning outcomes, and the ETBU experience.

Please comment in this section how your program contributes to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and the ETBU experience (i.e., integration of faith and learning) in its curriculum and practices. The following questions may be helpful in your discussions, but need not be covered in the report:

- To what extent do course and program learning outcomes (PLOs) align with the university's stated ILOs (Critical Thinking, Communicative Fluency, Information Literacy, and Biblical Foundations)? Provide curriculum map to show alignment and discuss any gaps or opportunities for improvement. (See Appendix D for a curriculum map template for mapping program courses to ILOs.)
- How are aspects of the ETBU experience (i.e. integration of faith and learning) embodied in the department's core teaching and learning practices? Review the course to ILO map for your program and discuss opportunities for alignment and assessment.

Finally, include a list of "researchable questions" that you will develop with the DASIR to anchor your report and to assure that the burning issues in your program are being addressed with appropriate evidence. Return to these questions where it makes sense in each section and at the end of the report to make sure you have addressed them.

Current Context for the Program/External Scan of Similar Programs

This section allows you to explain how your program is situated within its field(s) of study and how it is being affected by current trends in the larger landscape of higher education. Of similar programs and what might you learn from them? How is your program distinctive? How is it addressing the *emerging* issues within the field(s)? What proactive changes do you need to make to stay current? What are the macro issues affecting enrollments and prospects for the program's graduates in the wider world?

Identify two peer/aspirant institutions and one peer/aspirant or competitor institution offering the program of study. If the program is not offered at three institutions, alternative programs will be identified in consultation with the school dean and VPAA. If there are accrediting and/or professional standards that guide the discipline and program, the program may use them as one of the comparisons. Conduct a benchmarking analysis of the three identified institutions. Use the benchmarking summary sheet below to record your findings. The program will need to start with the degree requirements but may also need to conduct interviews of colleagues at the institutions. The purpose of the summary is to answer the following questions:

- How do program requirements, course offerings, and content compare to other

- institutions in quantity, scope, and depth?
- Is the program in sync with current trend and best practices in the field?
- What is unique about the ETBU program?
- Based on the findings, what changes (additions or modifications) should the program consider?

Benchmarking Summary Sheet

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Name of Comparison University: | | | |
| Contact Information: List names of people interviewed, websites and any other information. | | | |
| Briefly explain why the program was chosen. | | | |
| What similarities exist between ETBU's program and the institution's? Be sure to specifically examine the number of credit hours required. | | | |
| What differences exist between ETBU's program and the institution's? | | | |

Note: Include this summary sheet as an appendix to your report.

Progress in Completing the Previous Strategic Plan

Look at the previous strategic plan and evaluate the program's progress in completing the agreed upon activities. What activities have you undertaken successfully? Have those activities had the desired impact? What are some of the challenges you faced? Discuss any items that have not been completed.

Program Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map

Include here the program learning outcomes and a curricular map showing the relationship between program-learning outcomes and the curriculum. If needed, use the curriculum mapping template and instructions below as a tool to organize the curriculum mapping process. Summarize your reflections on outcomes at Institutional, Program and Course levels. Given the mission statement provided above and the context set by the field, your faculty should consider: what changes are needed in the curriculum and/or the learning outcomes? Your *curriculum map* specifies the connection between the curriculum and the program's stated student learning outcomes (i.e., which courses address which outcomes). Review the map and the adequacy of the outcomes considering

the following issues:

- How well does the curriculum address all of the articulated learning outcomes of the program and the university (i.e. ILOs)?
- Are the learning outcomes appropriate, differentiated, and sufficiently robust for a degree of this type?
- Can the learning outcomes be assessed? Where and how?
- Where and how does your program embody the ETBU Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and core commitments in teaching and learning practices?
- How does the curriculum introduce and develop student skills?
- How were the current outcomes developed? Are they still adequate and relevant?
- What changes should be made in the curriculum or program learning outcomes based on what is demonstrated by the curriculum map? What changes should be made to assessment efforts including how your program has “closed the loop” to effect curricular changes based on what you have been learning.
- (If applicable) How well do students perform in license or professional examinations, if any, and what do other external sources (e.g., placement supervisors, internship sites, employers) indicate about the preparation of the students for their intended goals?

Curriculum Mapping Template (extend table as needed)

List and label (e.g., 1-6) the program learning outcomes.

List all required courses for the major in column on the left.

For each course indicate which outcomes are addressed using the following key.

Level of instruction: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the senior or exit level

Assessment: project, paper, exam, portfolio, oral presentation, internship, Other (explain briefly)

| Course | PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs) | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|
| | PLO 1 | | PLO 2 | | PLO 3 | |
| | Level | Assessment | Level | Assessment | Level | Assessment |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes

The program should have multiple years of data and analyses in relation to program learning outcomes. Use this opportunity to “assess the assessments.” Claim the key insights you have had and how you have closed the loop with improvements in practice. If this is a new program or one that does not have a history of formal assessment, explain this and outline your new process for responding to this requirement. Determine if a student survey or focus groups should be utilized to supplement existing data; the DASIR can organize these processes and provide raw data and analysis to inform your review.

These questions will be helpful in guiding the discussion:

- What has the program learned about students and about the program's strengths and weaknesses through assessment of student learning? What assessment data support your analysis?
- How has assessment evidence of student learning led to program improvement? (Give two or three examples that demonstrate the following cycle: 1) Give findings for SLO X that show less than desirable results and a weakness in student learning that was noted in year A, 2) Describe the action taken in year B to seek improvement to the learning environment, 3) Give findings at the end of year B (or maybe not until the end of year C) to demonstrate an improvement was achieved.)
- What are the most important changes to the program driven by program assessment of student learning?
- What changes to student learning assessment processes or methods would improve the information gathered or how it is used?

A capstone course is likely the best place for you to assess many program learning outcomes. Please use this opportunity to review any other assessment reports that your program has generated, e.g., for General Education thematic categories.

Marketability, Recruitment, Retention, Graduation

In Semester 0 of your review, you will receive data sets charting student enrollment trends. Please evaluate your recruitment plan and consider how you can reach your targets. Delineate the distinctive and marketable features of the program. Your aim is to convey a clear strategy for communicating the distinctive features to relevant groups both within and beyond the University. You may get a better understanding of this by talking with the Admissions Office.

You should also evaluate your attempts to improve retention and graduation rates and, where appropriate, the results of licensing examinations and evaluations from external sources such as employers and internship supervisors. Consider the following questions:

- How is your program performing compared to ETBU averages? (enrollment numbers, number of graduates, etc.)
- What are trends in student enrollment and what measures are suggested to improve and/or maintain momentum?
- Are students being retained and graduating at an acceptable rate and with a length of study appropriate to the degree?
- How well does the make-up of your student population match that of ETBU or Texas? (in terms of GPA and/or ACT scores)
- What measures do you recommend to improve recruitment, retention, and graduation (including for diverse students)?

It is highly recommended that your program meet with representatives of Admissions early in the review process to maximize the value of this discussion.

Program Leadership and Faculty

The department chair and faculty members are expected to effectively articulate and support the program's vision and represent its interests. How actively and effectively does the department chair foster faculty cohesiveness and involvement in program decision-making? Are faculty members, including part-time faculty given sufficient training and support to improve student learning and assess program learning goals? What are opportunities for faculty development and scholarship? Evaluate the faculty full-time equivalent (FTE) in light of current load and projections. Provide a table with current FTEs and typical course loads.

Resources and Facilities

Evaluate the extent to which the program is housed in facilities adequate for its purposes. Consider support in terms of equipment and personnel. How well is information literacy integrated into your courses? Do students and faculty have access to sufficient library and information technology resources to assure quality learning? (This should be an objective discussion of what resources are available and how they are used. For example: where are faculty located, how many faculty in one office, lab space and number of students using the labs at any given time, flow of information as it relates to those involved in the communication.)

Future Trajectory of the Program

Use the review process to identify key strengths and resources in your program and its promise moving forward. This is a practice of *appreciative inquiry* where you take stock of what is working and clarify what you want to build on. Perhaps you have significantly increased enrollments or secured a new site for internships where your students can practice what they are learning in the world. You should also honestly evaluate your challenges at all levels. A SWOT analysis at the beginning and end of the review can aid in the response to this section (an informal scan of Strengths, Weaknesses, Threats and Opportunities for the program). What are your aspirations and specific proposals for expanding or enhancing your program?

Changes to be Made and Strategic Plan Points

The final section of your review will distill key points of learning that emerged from the self-study process and review of all available evidence. You should include all changes that you made or will make as a result of “closing the loop” into practice. You should also identify the key points you want to include in the final strategic plan (see part V of this document), including a request for resources (facilities, faculty, staff, etc.) with specific budget numbers where these are available. Use this part of the process to focus on the key elements that will ensure your success through the next review period.

V. DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

The Program Chair, working with the responsible Dean, faculty and staff in the program, prepares a report to specify the actions planned by the program in response to the self-study and input from administrators.

Consider the following questions based on the information gleaned from the SWOT analysis to help guide your focus:

- How can the strengths be leveraged to take advantage of opportunities?
- How can strengths be used to minimize threats?
- What can be done to minimize weaknesses so they won't stand in the way of opportunities?
- What can be done to ensure weaknesses don't prevent the ability to deal with threats? How can weaknesses be improved?

The strategic plan should focus on at least five, but no more than seven issues. For each item to be addressed, include the goal, a rationale for the goal based on the self-study, responsible parties, actions to be taken, and a timeline for those actions.

| Goal | Rationale for Goal Based on Program Review | Responsible Parties | Action Items/Resources Required | Benchmarks & Timeline |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

In this section of the review, include a statement indicating that progress reports on the proposed strategic plan will be submitted on an annual basis to the DASIR. Also, include a statement indicating the year of the next scheduled summative program review.

VI. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Sample Timeline for Program Review

Appendix B: Data Sets for Program Review from OIRE

Appendix C: SWOT Analysis Template

Appendix D: Template for Mapping PLOs to ILOs

Appendix E: Accredited Programs Substitution Form

APPENDIX A
Sample Timeline for Program Review
 2021-2022

| Date Complete | Who | Tasks | Deliverables |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| February 2021 | Core Faculty plus select adjuncts, DASIR. | Meet to finalize program review plan: SWOT, Vision/Mission, Researchable questions to anchor review. | Finalized program review plan. New draft of Vision & Mission (or plan to complete) |
| March 2021 | Core Faculty plus adjuncts, DASIR. | Student Survey Focus Groups. External Scan of comparable programs. Set up Capstone review. | Synopsis of findings for inclusion in report (draft). Plan for capstone review. |
| April 2021 | Core faculty and DASIR. | Curricular Mapping. | Curriculum Map for each program (major). |
| May 1, 2021 | Core faculty. | Context, history and findings synthesized into coherent narrative. Top-level recommendations emerge. | (Nearly) complete draft. |
| May 15, 2021 | Core Faculty. | Review all documents to see what is missing. Plan for summer research and drafting as necessary. | Plan for further analysis and completion of self-study. |
| June-July 2021 | Core Faculty and DASIR. | Summer tasks: Capstone Portfolio review meeting (1 day) | Capstone Assessment report. |
| September 2021 | Core Faculty. | Analyze grad/retention trends, class size trends, student credit hour, and faculty load trends. | Synopsis of findings for inclusion in report (draft). |
| January, 2022 | Core Faculty and DASIR. | Finalize top-level recommendations. | Complete Draft. |
| February, 2022 | Core faculty and DASIR. | Deal with loose ends/format and assemble appendices. | Final Report. |

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| March 1, 2022 | Chair of program. | Deliver Draft report to DASIR and Academic Deans Council | Draft of Program Review document. |
| April 15, 2022 | Academic Deans Council. | Review and Approve Program Review (may ask for changes or additions). | Program Review report approved. Council identifies top level concerns as focus for strategic plan and responds formally to committee. |
| May 1, 2022 | Chair, Dean VPAA | Final administrative review. | Requests for further information or clarification from department. |
| May 1, 2022 | Chair, Dean, DASIR | Program Review strategic plan, new PLOs, curricular map posted to departmental web site. | Program review disseminated as model of Assessment at ETBU. Balloons are released. Crowds cheer. |

APPENDIX B

Data Provided by Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

1. Number of Declared Majors by Program and Number of Declared Minors by Program
2. Graduation and Retention data by Major (as declared at first entry to ETBU)
3. Faculty Loads and Student Credit Hours Generated by Semester
4. Class Size Report for Fall and Spring Terms
5. Number of Graduates by Program
6. Most Recent Fact Book

APPENDIX C
Template for SWOT Analysis

Use this template to delineate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for your program based on your experience and all available evidence. You will get the most out of the process if it is embedded in a brainstorming discussion with your program faculty, student, and staff. Write the contributions of the group members on the board and come up with as many items as you can. Then go over the list collectively and prioritize the items most worthy of your attention during this self-study and through the next cycle of review.

| STRENGTHS | WEAKNESSES |
|-----------|------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| OPPORTUNITIES | THREATS |
|---------------|---------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

APPENDIX D

Map of Courses and Institutional Learning Outcomes (*Undergraduate Programs Only*)

List all the courses in the discipline in the column on the left.

Identify the type of course using the following key: R – Program requirement, E – Program Elective, G – General Education requirement, U – University requirement

For each course indicate which competencies are included using the following key.

Level of instruction: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the exit level

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, PO – Portfolio, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-Other (explain briefly)

| Course | Type | Critical Thinking | | Communicative Fluency | | Information Literacy | | Biblical Foundations | |
|--------|------|-------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Level | Assess | Level | Asses | Level | Assess | Level | Assess |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX E

Program Review Substitution Form for Accredited Programs

For programs that undergo professional or specialized accreditation, program review is coordinated with the accreditation or reaccreditation cycle. The report developed for professional or specialized accreditation reviews provides the essential requirements of program review and may be used for this purpose with approval by the VPAA. The completed table below is to be forwarded by the school dean to the OIRE for the substitution of accreditation self-study for the program review with a link to the accreditation agency's current standards in list or summary form. The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for maintaining a copy as part of the institution's accreditation archive and files.

Program: _____ **Accreditation Agency:** _____

Date of Self-Study Report: _____ **Form Completed by:** _____

| Program Review Component | Accreditation Standard (include section and page number where found in self-study) |
|--|--|
| 1. Introduction a. brief history of the program b. process by which the review was developed | |
| 2. Mission and Vision a. program's mission statement b. alignment with the school's mission statement and the university's mission statement c. overlap with and contributions to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) | |
| 3. Current Context within Field a. external scan of similar programs b. macro issues and trends | |
| 4. Progress since the Last Review a. review of progress since the last review based on accrediting agency's recommendations b. updates related to interim or progress reports as applicable | |
| 5. Program Learning Outcomes a. program learning outcomes b. curriculum map that displays the connection between course learning outcomes (CLOs) and program learning outcomes (PLOs) | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. summary on the relationship between the two | |
| <p>6. Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. curricular changes since the last review b. assessment plan c. description of data used to assess student learning d. findings of the program's strengths and weaknesses e. program's contribution to General Education | |
| <p>7. Marketability, Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. distinctive and marketable features of the program b. recruitment and enrollment trends; student profile c. evaluation of retention and graduation rates | |
| <p>8. Program Leadership and Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. faculty profile and workload b. inclusion of part-time faculty into curricular decisions and the assessment of student learning c. faculty development and scholarship opportunities | |
| <p>9. Resources and Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. adequacy of physical facilities b. adequacy of equipment and personnel c. adequacy of library resources | |
| <p>10. Future Trajectory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. program's strengths and challenges b. projected improvements and changes c. additional resources to support mission | |
| <p>Link to current accreditation standards:</p> <p>Date(s) of next scheduled accreditation review:</p> <p>Date(s) of interim or progress reports if applicable:</p> | |

Submitted to OIRE

Date:

Reviewed by Office of Academic Affairs (Accreditation)

Date: