Academic Program Review

Academics & Research – Academics & Instruction

Academic Policy 303-40	**Authority: University President**
Effective: Fall Quarter, 2015	**Proponent: Academic Senate**

Summary: This policy prescribes requirements and standards for academic program review at Eastern Washington University.

History: This policy was approved by the Academic Senate on March 14, 2014 and adopted by the University President on May 21, 2014. It will become effective Fall Quarter, 2015.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

Role of Departments and Programs, Colleges, and University

The Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC) requires that all academic programs be reviewed on a regular basis. The goals of this process are self-evaluation and curricular revitalization to allow each program to assess and to plan for the challenges of the future. Program review is extremely important for development of informed decisions about program, faculty and student needs. A successful program review depends upon faculty willingness to engage in an intensive and comprehensive self-study and program plan using both qualitative and quantitative data. It provides an opportunity for all department/program faculty members to share opinions and to discuss ideas. Professional discourse among colleagues about the educational needs of students, the program and society at-large is essential.

Guided by each college's planning framework, program reviews lay out multi-year plans that advance the university mission.

The purpose of academic program review at EWU relates to three primary functions:

  1. Accountability: Academic program review is one way to ensure to students, parents, Board of Trustees, NWCCU, and the public it serves that EWU is providing quality programs.

  2. Program Improvement: The academic program review process provides a continuing cycle for department/program faculty, staff, and administrators to receive timely information and a forum for providing feedback, ensuring an institutional commitment for quality program improvement.

  3. Program and Resource Alignment: Academic Program Review provides the means to ensure that EWU will offer an appropriate array of academic programs and that the institutional resources will be effectively aligned with it academic programs.

For the purposes of Academic Program Review, a program is a major, an option under a major, or an approved certificate program.

Academic program review will be required for any major or approved certificate program in the department/program identified for program review. The Program Review Schedule will be updated annually and posted on the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research website.

The Vice Provost and the PRC will provide support to departments/programs undergoing program review. This will include the provision of a workshop on the requirements, the timelines, the statistical data, and any other element of the program review process that is needed or requested. Each program will be assigned a liaison from the PRC, one of whose responsibilities is to assist the program with its process.

CHAPTER 2 - PROGRAMS WITHOUT EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

2-1. Procedures

a. The department/program faculty shall forward all final documents to the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and to the Faculty Organization Office by May 15 of the review year. The department chair or program director/coordinator shall be responsible for ensuring the completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document (see section 8-1, Cover-Sheet Template) shall verify that the department/program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the amended Five-Year Plan and will note the date of approval. The results of the faculty vote shall also be noted.

b. The PRC, following written guidelines and protocols in the Program Review Committee Policies and Procedures, will examine the department/program's completed Five-Year Review documents and will meet with the Dean or designee, Department Chair/Program Director, faculty, and others deemed appropriate.

c. The PRC shall write its final report to the Senate, using a consistent format (see chapter 10, PRC Format for Response to Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Program Reviews) to provide its recommendations. The PRC shall determine one of four possible recommendations for the program:

(1) Continuation *without* modification;

(2) Continuation with modification, to be specifically identified by the PRC, with a report or reports to the PRC about progress on the modification, on a timeline to be specified by the PRC;

(3) Continuation of the program for a specific amount of time, with annual monitoring by the PRC and the Dean of issues identified in the program review, on a timeline to be specified by the PRC;

(4) Discontinuance of the program.

The PRC will attach to its final response the Executive Summary from the Department/Program's Self-Study.

d. The Senate reviews the report submitted by the PRC.

(1) If the report is approved, it is sent to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(2) If the report is not approved, it is returned to the PRC for reconsideration based on the Senate input. The revised report is submitted to the Senate, who will vote to approve or disapprove it. In either case, the report is forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs with the Senate's recommendation.

e. After receiving the Senate's and the PRC's recommendations, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee), will meet with the Department Chair(s)/Program Director(s), Dean (or designee), PRC Chair (or designee), and other appropriate administrators and faculty to discuss the program and recommendations for the next five years. At the close of the meeting, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee), in consultation with the Dean, will prepare a memorandum of understanding (MOU) identifying the agreed upon recommendations to be implemented.

f. The Provost will forward the MOU to the Department, Program Director for programs not affiliated with a Department, College, PRC, Chair of the Academic Senate, the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research, and the Faculty Organization Office.

g. The Provost will forward the MOU containing the agreed upon recommendations to the President of the University for his/her action and recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

2-2. Review Documents - Contents

Contents of Academic Program Reviews for Programs *without* external accreditation. The Five-Year Review document shall be formatted according to the following procedures.

a. **Summary:** Summarize, in no more than five (5) pages, the entire report, including the items listed in Chapter 8 (Submission Expectations for Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Program Reviews).

b. **Self-Study.** Each program shall use the Academic Performance Review Statistics from Institutional Research, and provide a table (see chapter 9, Required PRC Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review Academic Performance Review Statistics, for more information) showing relevant program data for the past five (5) years including:

(1) Student demographics of majors, minors, options, and certificates;

(2) Student level of majors, minors, options, and certificates;

(3) Faculty and academic allocation;

(4) Course and degree data (see chapter 9); and

(5) Program cost.

c. **Additional Information.** The department/program will also include the following information in the Self-Study:

(1) Summary of Previous Review and Plan. This document will address a summary of the last program review and the Plan developed at that time, discuss the department/program's progress in implementing that Plan and/or modification to the Plan, and discuss any discrepancies between the last Program Review and the ensuing Three-Year Progress report. This document will also describe achievements of the department/program since the last review (if not mentioned above), for example, important curricular changes, grants, faculty professional achievements, external honors received by

students, changes in location or mode of instructional delivery.

(2) Description of the Department's Programs

    (a) General

- Include a catalog description of all certificates, majors and options.

- Include a statement that defines the discipline in terms of its worldview. How does this view inform the content, pedagogy and objectives of each program? Include a statement that defines what the discipline contributes to the academic mission of the University.

- Summarize the curricular rationale for offering each certificate, major and option.

- Indicate the number of credits required in each certificate, major and option (Table form).

- Discuss the service value of the program to other units in the college, university and community.

- Describe the centrality of the certificate, major or option to the mission of the college and the larger mission of the University.

- Describe the way that the program meets local, regional or state needs now. Will it continue to meet these needs over the next five (5) years? Resources: Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education and Findings of the Economic Needs Assessment Workgroup (http://www.wsac.wa.gov/publications-library/master-plans)

- Describe the extent to which this program duplicates or overlaps with other programs at the University. Could the program's effectiveness be retained by combining it with other units?

- If this program duplicates offerings of other public four-year institutions in Washington, explain what particular student populations it serves at EWU?

- If the department offers General Education courses, a summary of data for student learning outcomes will be included.

- What specific courses are offered by the program that are required by other departments/programs?

    (b) Faculty

- Supply an updated vita for each faculty member and attach as an appendix.

- Explain the department/programs's rationale for distributing faculty loads.

- Describe any changes in faculty personnel over the last five years.

- Describe the types of service to external groups that your faculty provides.

- Provides a summary of scholarly output over the last five years for each tenured/tenure-track faculty member teaching in the program.

- Explain any types of efforts the department/program employs specifically to improve teaching effectiveness.

    (c) Support Services

- Describe the adequacy of library collections and service for your programs.

- Describe the adequacy of computing services for your programs.

- Describe any other resource needs relevant to your programs.

(3) Program Quality

    (a) Program Goals

- What is the quality of the program? Assessment of quality should take into account the quality of the faculty[1], the value and distinctive character of the program[1] and student performance. Use the end-of-program assessment reports as one measure of quality.

- What are the educational goals of the program?

- Are the goals of the program appropriate for the blend of faculty members and students that are in the program?

- What are the intended outcomes, both content and skills, of the program?

- How is progress towards program goals monitored?

- What process is used for regularly reviewing goals, courses and curricular structures in light of the findings of assessment activities?

- What modifications have been made recently in the goals or in the program?

---

[1] Qualitative evaluation should be emphasized here. Some examples might be: co-curricular activities, which enhance program offerings and have helped the program meet accreditation requirements.

- For each please supply a copy of the program's Student Learning Outcomes Assessment plan. Summarize the data, what has been learned from this information, and measures to improve the program based on assessment.

(b) Structure of the Curriculum

- How is the curriculum structured and how was the structure determined?

- Does the program begin with survey courses or with more specialized introductions to the field?

- What is the structure of the middle range of courses?

- Do the middle-range courses include attention to connections with other fields and with the learning that is occurring in the other parts of the curriculum (for example, in general-education courses)? Explain.

- Are students introduced early to the modes of inquiry and methodology of the discipline?

- Do beginning or middle-range courses introduce students to the contested issues of the field and provide students the opportunity to engage actively with these issues? Explain.

- Is there a common core of courses taken by all students in the program? If so, explain how the core is structured.

- Is there a capstone experience (for example, a senior seminar, a senior project, a thesis, or comprehensive examinations) that provides students with an opportunity to integrate the learning that has occurred throughout their college experience? If so explain the nature of these courses.

- Discuss the ratio of students who start out as first time freshmen in your program to those who started at the University as transfers, and the impact on program(s) (undergraduate programs).

- Discuss the distribution of the department/programs' teaching resources in lower and upper division courses and the implications of this distribution on program(s) (undergraduate programs).

(c) Integration

- How is the scholarship activity of faculty incorporated into course work? Explain.

- Do experiences provided in the program connect with the principal career options

available to graduates of the program? Explain.

- How do faculty members link their courses to the overall goals of the program?

- How does the program curriculum interface with the general-education curriculum?

(d) Teaching

- How does the department/program evaluate teaching? What is done with the data collected?

- Who in the department is cognizant of research in teaching and learning specific to the discipline?

- What types of teaching techniques are used in the courses in the program?

- How is student learning evaluated in the courses?

(e) Advising

- How is the transition from general University advising to departmental advising addressed?

- How are students in the program advised?

- Are there also less formal opportunities for faculty/student interaction?

(f) Student Diversity

- Does the department/program have goals for enhancing student diversity and if so what are they?

- Does the department assess which courses critically influence students' decisions on whether or not to major in the department's programs?

- Is the faculty of the department diverse, representing appropriately the availability of faculty members from underrepresented groups?

- If an imbalance persists after extensive efforts have been made to recruit and retain faculty members from underrepresented groups, does the department nonetheless demonstrate to students diversity among professionals in the field, both in perspectives on critical issues in the field and in sex, race, and ethnicity?

- Have faculty members in the program explored the potential benefit of alliances with units on campus that serve diverse groups of students, such as the University's diversity programs, Women's

Studies, the Women's Center, or the Pride Center?

- Where appropriate, does the program assess its curriculum for the inclusion of relevant new scholarship about women and minorities?

(g) Institutional Support

- How does the department/program mentor new faculty members?

- Are faculty development activities available for faculty members at all levels?

- What curriculum development activities have been undertaken recently in the program?

- Are funds available to support assessment and evaluation activities?

(h) Assessment

- What are the intended student learning outcomes of the program?

- What are the assessment procedures used to determine the extent to which student learning outcomes are achieved?

- To what extent are student learning outcomes achieved?

- Are students well served by this program and how?

- How satisfied are alumni with the program? (Data to be supplied by the Office of Institutional Research, Demography, and Assessment.)

- Based on assessment findings, what actions have been taken to improve the quality and productivity of the program?

(4) A justification for undergraduate programs requiring more than 180 credits shall be included.

d. Plan. The Academic Program Review will describe plans for changes and for improvement in order to maintain leadership in the respective fields. Therefore, each department shall develop a plan for the next five (5) years.

The Five-Year Plan will address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study. The plan will take into account what the faculty has learned from the SLO Assessment process. A draft of the Plan will be provided to the External Reviewer. After receiving the External Reviewer's Report, the program shall either amend the draft plan to comply with the recommendations of the External Reviewer or explain why no amendment is necessary.

In forming this plan, the program shall address the following four areas (these questions provide guidelines):

(1) **Curriculum.** What curricular changes do you envision during the next five years/accreditation cycles? What developments are likely to cause you to change the curriculum? Discuss prospects and changes relevant to all locations in which the program is offered. What changes are planned, if any, for General Education?

(2) **Students.** Do you see the number of students majoring in the program increasing or decreasing during the next five years/accreditation cycles? Refer back to the statistics provided in your Self-study. Do you anticipate new programs or outreach to new student populations? Will the career opportunities open to your graduates change during the next five years/accreditation cycles? How will your program adjust its curriculum and program practices to prepare students for those opportunities? Do you expect your total enrollment to increase or decrease during the next five years/accreditation cycles? How are advising and retention studied and supported for students in the program? Are changes needed in the program's learning goals? How will you assist students in attaining those goals during the next five years/accreditation cycles? What are your specific plans in the areas of curriculum change, outreach, scheduling and retention to increase student enrollment? Are the lines of communication open between students and faculty?

(3) **Faculty.** What changes do you foresee for the program faculty? What does the University need to do to maintain or improve support for the current faculty? Do you anticipate that you will be requesting new regular faculty members? If so, what will be the basis for these requests? Are the lines of communication open between Chairs, deans, administrators and faculty? Is advising shared fully by the faculty?

(4) *Resources. Will your current level of resources (staff, equipment, library resources, travel funds, etc.) be adequate to permit the maintenance or improvement of program quality during the next five years/accreditation cycles? Identify needs based on program priorities.*

(5) Elements of the preceding four areas, (1) to (4), addressed in the Plan should include the following, where relevant:

(a) The expected action/change to be taken, e.g., revision of curriculum, addition of faculty, purchase of equipment, etc.

(b) A specific timeline for completing the task.

(c) Person(s) responsible for carrying out the needed change.

(d) Anticipated cost.

e. External Reviewer's Report

It is policy at Eastern Washington University that all reviews of existing programs will include an evaluation by appropriate individuals external to the department and the institution. Accordingly, the college Dean with final approval of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) will designate an External Reviewer to conduct an independent evaluation of each program.

The college Dean can select the reviewer from a list of candidates supplied by the departments concerned or recruit his or her own reviewer. The college Dean will select an external reviewer to review the undergraduate program(s) and a different reviewer to review the graduate program(s). For program suggested reviewers a current résumé must be supplied. This individual must be an established professional in the relevant discipline, with appropriate academic experience at a peer institution. The department may appeal to the Dean any external reviewer who, in the judgment of its faculty, is unqualified or otherwise unsuitable for the task.

The college Dean, in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs, will appoint the External Reviewer(s) from among the candidates. The college Dean will then notify the department of the appointment. The department makes the arrangements for the External Reviewer(s) to undertake his/her evaluation of the program.

To assist the review process the External Reviewer will receive:

• The most recent five-year Academic Performance Review Statistics from Institutional Research;

• The Self-Study, including all attachments;

• Three-year reports written since the previous five-year review;

• The Plan;

• The prior MOU;

• The Mission Statements of the University, the College, and the Program; and

• Any additional documents the program deems helpful.

The External Reviewer will meet with the Dean, the program Chair/Director, faculty, students, staff, library liaison, and others during the on-site visit.

The External Reviewer's Report shall address the program's strengths as well as weaknesses, and offer suggestions for improvement of the program, fulfillment of its mission and enhancement of its position with respect to system-wide and national trends.

f. Program's Response. Upon receiving the External Reviewer's Report, the faculty of the program will respond in writing. Recommendations, concerns and issues raised by the External Reviewer will be addressed in light of the Mission Statement, program need, the Plan, fiscal limitations, and logistical issues. The Dean reviews and approves the response before the response is forwarded.

The Program's Response to the External Reviewer's Report will be forwarded electronically (and two hard copies of the entire Five-Year Program Review with copies of all of the three-year reports submitted since the prior Five-Year Program Review) to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and to the Faculty Organization Office by May 15 of the review year, along with the Self-Study, the Plan (as amended following the Outside Reviewer's Report), and all other documentation required for the Review. The PRC oral review will not be held until all documents are in place.

2-3. Timeline

Five-Year Review Submission Timeline for programs *without* external accreditation

Winter: The Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office will update the Five-Year Program Review Schedule and post it to the web and send the link to all faculty, the Deans/Associate Deans, and the Provost/Vice Provosts.

March: prior to the start of Spring Quarter: Notification of Five-Year Review is sent to Department Chairs or Program Directors by the Faculty Organization Office with copies to the Dean and the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research.

Spring Quarter: The Department Chair or Program Director will coordinate the work of the department in the preparation of the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan.

May: Postponement requests, with full justification, are due *no later than the first PRC meeting of May* and must be signed by the Dean. Department/Program representation MUST attend the meeting to answer the PRC questions regarding the request.

End of Fall: Electronic submission deadline for the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan and designation of the External Reviewer(s).

Winter Quarter: Early in the quarter a date for the External Reviewer Visitation will be set and that date will be provided to the PRC. The Department Chair/Program Director or designee will provide the External Reviewer with the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan and other appropriate materials prior to the visitation date. The External Reviewer's Report will be received prior to the end of Winter Quarter.

End of Winter Quarter: the College Dean or Associate Dean shall meet with the department/program Review Committee to review and discuss the Self-Study, the draft Five-Year Plan, and the External Reviewer's report. The External Reviewer's Report is due in electronic format to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office at the end of Winter Quarter.

Early Spring Quarter: the College Dean shall submit written comments to the department/program's Review Committee for consideration by the program faculty in

order for the department/program faculty to prepare a written response to the External Reviewer's Report(s) and finalize an amended Five-Year Plan, if needed.

May 15th (or before): the Response to the External Reviewer's Report and the Revised Plan are due in electronic format to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office on May 15th. Two (2) hard copies of the entire Five-Year Program Review (in the required format and with a department/program summary page and copies of all of the Three-Year Reports submitted to the PRC since the prior Five-Year Program Review) are also due to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office on May 15th.

The Provost and College Dean will be notified if a submission is not received by the deadline.

In the Fall Quarter of the following year, the PRC will set a meeting date for department/program representatives to meet with the PRC to discuss the review materials submission. These meetings continue as needed throughout the Fall and Winter Quarters. All Five-Year reviews completed by the department/program during the prior fiscal year will be forwarded to the Academic Senate for review and approval by the end of winter quarter of the academic year following the submission deadline.

MOU meetings will be convened by the Provost (or designee) as appropriate and it is expected that all reviews will have gone through the Senate and completed the MOU process by May 30 or before of the academic year following the submission deadline.

Summer of the academic year following the submission deadline: The Provost forwards the MOU containing the agreed upon recommendations to the President of the University for his/her action and recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

CHAPTER 3 - PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

3-1. Procedures

Programs that must complete an accreditation will, as soon as possible thereafter, submit to the PRC evidence of the positive outcome of this review in order to be granted continuation status by the PRC. They are thus exempted from the reporting requirements contained in chapter 2 of this document and instead are subject to the specific reporting as specified in this chapter. However, should they fail to receive outside accreditation, they must comply in full with the non-accredited reporting requirements within the current or subsequent academic year, as arranged with the PRC Chair.

3-2. Review Documents - Contents

Contents of Academic Program Reviews for Programs *with* external accreditation. Programs that must complete an accreditation review shall submit to PRC the following items:

a. **Appropriate documentation** (e.g. a confirmation letter) from its outside accreditation authorities (e.g. AACSB) indicating that it has been granted accredited status in its particular field of instruction, along with a brief summary of the main findings of its outside accrediting body.

b. **Submission Summary.** Summarize, in no more than ten (10) pages, the entire report including items c-e below.

c. **Plan.** The Academic Program Review will describe plans for change and improvement in order to maintain leadership in the respective fields. Therefore, each department shall develop a plan for the next five years accreditation cycle. Development of this plan should benefit departments applying for new tenure-track positions by providing information to support and justify these requests. In forming this plan, the department shall address the following four areas (these questions provide guidelines):

(1) Summary of Program Changes. A brief memo summarizing the main program changes that have been made since the last review and those that are planned over the period until the next scheduled accreditation review.

(2) Curriculum and student learning. A brief memo summarizing the program's learning outcome assessment procedures and any results derived from those procedures, Curricular Program statistics provided by Institutional Research, and a discussion of recruitment, advising, retention, and growth potential.

(3) Faculty. A brief memo outlining and justifying the department's sequence of expected tenure track faculty hiring needs for the period until the next accreditation review. Include a discussion of leadership and climate in the department, as well as workload concerns.

(4) Resources. A brief memo listing and explaining any academic resource requirements (e.g., library, information technology, assistive technology, instructional support, facilities, etc.) needed for the effective functioning of the program and maintenance and improvement of the quality of teaching and research, as specified in the accreditation review or required to meet EWU standards.

d. For programs requiring more than the minimum (180) credits, in the baccalaureate degree, a memo justifying the need for the larger number of credits or detailing how the required credits will be reduced to 180 credits.

e. A copy of the outside accreditation review documentation and a copy of the guidelines, criteria or other requirements of the outside accrediting body.

3-3. Timeline

Accreditation Cycle Review Submission Timeline for programs *with* external accreditation:

(Note: Since accreditation takes place at various times of the year, there is not a specific timeline for this process.

Reporting requirements are based upon requirements of the accreditation body.)

Summer: The Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office will update the Accreditation Cycle Program Review Schedule and post it to the web and send the link to all faculty, the Deans/Associate Deans, and the Provost/Vice Provosts.

September: prior to the start of Fall Quarter: Department Chair/Program Director will check the Program Review Schedule posted on the web and will notify the Senate Office if the date of the anticipated accreditation review is different from that stated on the Review Schedule.

Same date as deadline for Submission of the Accreditation Review Materials: The Department Chair/Program Director will provide an electronic copy of the entire accreditation submission to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office, with a cover letter stating the approximate timeline for the accreditation review, including the approximate time that they expect to receive accreditation confirmation.

In the following weeks the department/program will gather the additional materials required by the PRC (in the required format and with a program summary page and copies of all of the Three-Year Reports submitted to PRC since the prior Accreditation Cycle Program Review). These materials will be provided electronically to the Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office no later than the following quarter and prior to receipt of the confirmation of accreditation.

The letter from the accreditation body confirming accreditation will be sent to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office when received by the program, along with two (2) hard copies of the required materials and one hard copy of the accreditation submission.

The PRC will set a meeting date for program representatives to meet with the PRC to discuss the review submission.

MOU meetings will be convened by the Provost (or designee) with the intent of finalizing the process during the academic year in which confirmation of accreditation is received.

The Provost forwards the MOU containing the agreed upon recommendations to the President of the University for his/her action and recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

CHAPTER 4 - REQUESTS FOR DELAY OR EXTENSION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

a. Minor procedural delays within the academic year are generally granted with the expectation that the program will adhere to the timeline as closely as possible. Requests for such delays are made to the PRC in writing through the Faculty Organization Office, with written approval from the Dean.

b. Programs with external accreditation are granted an automatic date change on the Program Review

c. Schedule to coincide with the receipt of the approved external accreditation. The need for such change is made to the PRC in writing through the Faculty Organization Office, with written concurrence from the Dean.

d. Programs without external accreditation requesting a full year extension (postponement) of their scheduled Academic Program Review (APR) must use the following process:

(1) The request for extension shall provide a detailed explanation of the extraordinary circumstances motivating the request. Approval by the Dean of the program's college shall accompany the written request, addressed to the Chair of the PRC and delivered to the Faculty Organization Office. The request for a one year extension from the PRC shall be submitted no later than the first PRC meeting of May (and must be signed by the Dean) during the year prior to the year in which the review is originally scheduled. In extraordinary circumstances, the PRC has approved two-year extensions.

(2) If an extension is approved, in order to prepare for the following year's review, the program shall submit a progress report (or draft submission) by May 1 of the academic year in which the APR was originally scheduled, indicating the state of data collection and preparation of the APR document. The department/program shall schedule the outside review during the Summer or Fall Quarter of the extension year, to occur as early as possible. The PRC will receive the completed program review no later than January 31st of the extension year.

CHAPTER 5 - MISSING OR INCOMPLETE SUBMISSIONS

When the PRC cannot resolve submission difficulties, the Chair of the PRC may notify the Dean and

Associate Dean, as well as the Vice Provost and Senate Chair, with requests for additional information. If the program's External Reviewer's Report *has not been received* by the Senate Office by the end of Winter quarter, the PRC Chair, in concert with the Academic Senate Chair, will send a memo to the Dean and the Provost notifying them of the lack of compliance with the PRC timeline, WITH a copy to the Program

Chair/Director. In that memo, the PRC may set a new date for the review in the next academic year.

If the Response to the External Reviewer's Report and Revised Plan are *incomplete* on May 15, the department/program's Review Committee will prepare a review document with the notation that the submission was not complete and that the department/program's Review Committee will not formally request continuance until those aspects of the submission are received. The department/program's Review Committee members shall return all copies of the review materials received to the Faculty Organization Office, for use by the PRC members in the following year. These steps will advise the next PRC of what needs to be done in the next year.

Requests for tenure-track positions will not be considered without a current Five-Year Review that has been approved by the Academic Senate.

CHAPTER 6 - MONITORING OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The Faculty Organization Office will provide assistance to the PRC and the Departments/Colleges in tracking the Program Review Process and implementation of the PRC recommendations for review dates and approved postponements.

The Department Chair or Program Director is responsible for carrying out the curricular, structural and assessment recommendations specified in the PRC Program Review document and noting progress on these changes in the subsequent Three-Year Report. The College Dean or Dean's appointee will monitor implementation of the PRC recommendations in said Program Review documents.

CHAPTER 7 - THREE-YEAR PROGRESS REPORTS

Three-year Progress Reports will be prepared and submitted by either the Department or the Program in a timely manner. Copies of the Progress Report, and the Academic Program Review (Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review), will be submitted to the appropriate College Dean and electronically to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research.   Since these reports include accountability measures and quality improvement provisions, these reports inform the decision-making procedures for the Programs, Departments, and Colleges, particularly with regard to resource allocation decisions and realignment. College Deans, Department Chairs, and Program Directors will use these materials to work together to reach a consensus about the future direction of the program and College as well as for making decisions for immediate needs. As part of its Program Review Report to the Senate, the Program Review Committee (PRC) (see chapter 11, Program Review Committee Composition) will submit a report including its recommendations regarding the program, and the Summary provided in the Program's Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review Self-Study (see chapter 8).

The Senate reviews the report submitted by the PRC.

   a. If the report is approved, it is sent to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

   b. If the report is not approved, it is returned to the PRC for reconsideration based on the Senate input.   The revised report is submitted to the Senate, who will vote to approve or disapprove it. In either case, the report is forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs with the Senate's recommendation.

After receiving the Senate's and the PRC's recommendations, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) will meet with the Program Director/Department Chair(s), Dean (or designee), PRC representative, and other appropriate administrators and faculty, to discuss the program recommendations for change.   At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Dean, will prepare a memorandum of understanding (MOU) identifying the agreed upon recommendations to be implemented and identifying the resources needed to support the recommendations.

7-1. Introduction and Planning Discussions

In year three following the Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review, each program will provide a brief Report (1 page of text, 1 page of assessment results and discussion as described below, and 1 page of statistics as provided by Institutional Research) to be submitted to the College Dean and electronically to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research (designee for the Provost's copy) and to the Faculty Organization Office (end of Winter Quarter).

These Reports shall include updates of program (including curricular changes) and resource changes (including notations of faculty retirements and hiring, and faculty release time), program learning outcomes assessment activity prepared by the department/program and other program performance data provided by Institutional Research. In addition, in years when requests are made for new tenure-track faculty hires, the report should include brief documentation of the outcome of faculty meetings in which decisions were made regarding new tenure-track faculty requests. This will include the outcome of votes supporting specific new requests and search information that could be of use to future search committees. These Reports provide the basis for short-term planning consultation between the program and appropriate administrators, present facts, and record the outcome(s) of processes for reference in the future. These Reports provide data for the Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Academic Program Review, and are especially useful to validate progress on the PRC recommendations; these Reports track tenure-track requests and the outcomes of those requests; and ensure continuity   and   full   disclosure   between   the outgoing/incoming   department   chairs.   Viewed   as progress on the department or program's Five-Year Plan, departments/programs will file these Reports in the Office of the Vice provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the

Senate Office. These Reports will become part of the Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Academic Program Review whether or not a program has outside accreditation. These Reports are a valuable mechanism to hold departments and the administration jointly accountable for academic program quality and provide departments with the following benefits:

• Documentation of actions toward fulfilling their five year or accreditation cycle plans

• Documentation of administrative commitments made during the last program review and notations of follow through; this will allow the Senate Chair to assist the department in rectifying any lack of follow though

• Documentation of progress made toward the PRC recommendations or modifications of the program as an update to the Dean, the PRC Chair and the Senate

• For incoming Department Chairs, these reports will provide documentation which will get them up to speed more quickly on issues such as the PRC's response to the department's plans, the department's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in the plan, the administration's support for the department, recent changes in curriculum and in the department's enrollment, faculty, SFR and FTES data. New chairs will no longer be left in the situation of trying to create a five-year review with little or no information from the prior years.

• The Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Program Review will be much easier to accomplish with these Reports to refer to; chairs only need to add the planning piece and arguments for additional support; the basic data required for the PRC reports will already be in place

• These Reports will be valuable to the external reviewers

• These Reports will allow departments to spot increases or decreases in enrollments, majors, minors, etc., earlier, allowing the department to adjust more quickly to changes in demands on the department

Three-Year Report Timeline

After consultation with the department/program faculty, the Department Chair/ Program Director will submit the 3 page Report to the College Dean at the end of Winter Quarter. These reports will reflect the plans and actions which form much of the basis for administrative allocation of resources to the program. At the same time, a copy of the Report will also be submitted electronically to the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office no later than Spring Quarter and will be available to the PRC as additional information during the Program's Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review Process.

7-2. Three-Year Report Format

a. Content Overview: Three-Year Reports shall consist of the four following parts:

(1) A Brief Self-Study

(2) A Summary of Assessment Results

(3) Statistics obtained from Institutional Research through the Associate Dean

(4) An updated/revised Five-Year Plan will be included with the Six-Year Report

a. A one-page self-study reporting on progress with departmental planning, review, assessment processes, and programmatic needs.

Each department/program will produce a brief Three-Year Report describing progress toward its goals, problems reaching its goals, revision of goals, and initiatives. This document will indicate how the results of the program's assessment efforts support its conclusions and also record significant events which have occurred or are imminent, such as changes to resources, retirements, new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc. This report, approximately one page in length, will be developed during Winter Quarter by the department/program, discussed with appropriate administrators, and a copy will be kept on file in the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants, & Institutional Research and the Faculty Organization Office. Together with the most recent program review, these reports form part of the basis for short-term planning consultations between the department/program and appropriate administrators. The collection of these Reports since the last program review will assist the PRC and the department/program in writing and reviewing the next program review document.

b. A one-page summary of assessment results and ensuing or necessary revisions as noted in section 7-1.

All departments/programs must assess progress toward their program's goals and student learning outcomes (SLO) in a way that provides evidence of the success of current efforts or of the need for change. While the particular means of assessment must be tailored to the specific program, this page should contain a reflection upon progress made and changes with respect to the SLO assessment plan that is reported on in the five-year or accreditation cycle review self-study as detailed in Section 8-3, subsection 2.3.H., of this document. This reflection should describe any changes made to the assessment plan in the preceding 12 months, summarize activities carried out to implement the assessment plan by the department/program in the preceding 12 months, and summarize the results of any SLOs assessed in the preceding 12 months. It is suggested that rather than assess all the SLOs in the year the five-year or accreditation cycle review self-study is prepared, that programs stagger their assessment over the five years/accreditation cycles between reviews. This would allow programs to assess one or more outcomes each year and report on them in these Reports to make the assessment and five-year or accreditation cycle review

processes more manageable. Therefore, it is suggested that the assessment section of these Reports include the following information:

• Which student learning outcome(s) were assessed

• What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure the SLOs

• What participants were sampled to assess the SLOs

• What assessment results were obtained, highlighting important findings from the data collected

• How the assessment results were (or will be) used, e.g. changes in course content, course sequence, student advising, etc., as well as any revisions to the assessment process the results suggests are needed

c. A one-page report from Institutional Research through the Associate Dean showing numeric data summaries of the programs.

The Office of Institutional Research, Demography and Assessment produces an annual report in standard format. Delivered to the program, this report will be attached to the Three Report of the Program Unit. It shall include (see chapter 9 for definitions):

(1) Student demographics of majors, minors, options, and certificates;

(2) Student level of majors, minors, options, and certificates;

(3) Faculty allocation;

(4) Course data; and

(5) Budget data.

This statistical document is expected to be approximately one page long and will contain the same data as required for the five-year review (see chapter 9). The Three Report may include one or two pages of supplemental information, as appendices, in the form of graphical presentation (e.g., line graphs), tables, and pertinent discussion which summarize the data of the last several (3-5) years to make changes and trends more apparent

d. Updated/revised Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Plan to accompany the Three-Year Report.

CHAPTER 8 - SUBMISSION EXPECTATIONS FOR FIVE-YEAR OR ACCREDITATION CYCLE PROGRAM REVIEWS

8-1. Cover-Sheet Template

Eastern Washington University

Five-Year **or Accreditation Cycle** Program Review for
[insert program name]

[insert academic year of the review]

Self-Study and 5-Year or Accreditation Cycle Plan approved by faculty on: [insert date; insert results of faculty vote]

External Reviewer Report received by the program on: [insert date]

Program's Response to External Reviewer's Report completed on: [insert date]

Complete Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Program Review Report submitted to CAPR on: [insert date]

[NOTE: Please follow this format closely, including title page and table of contents, for your organization of your Five-year Review Report. **Please remove** all explanatory notes below to complete your plan.]

8-2. Table of contents Template

Table of Contents

8-3. Submission Content for Table of Content Areas

(NOTE: The PRC encourages programs to be as efficient as possible in providing the information requested in this outline.)

1. Summary of the Program [max. 5 pages]

The outline should be used as a guide to writing the Summary. *All* items (1-5) should be summarized.

2. Self-Study

2.1. *Summary of Previous Review and 5-Year or Accreditation-Cycle Plan*

• previous plan summary

• progress in implementing the previous Plan, what remains to be completed, other achievements

(other program achievements, faculty professional achievements, and student achievements). Give a brief summary here, and attach details, if any, as appendix)

2.2. *Program Description (see section 2-2)*

A.   General
B.   Faculty and Staff
C.   Support Services

2.3. *Program Quality (see section 2-2)*

A.   Program Goals
B.   Structure of the Curriculum
C.   Integration
D.   Teaching
E.   Advising
F.   Student Diversity
G.   Institutional Support
H.   Assessment

2.4. *Credits Requirement*

• State that 180 credits are required. If more than 180 credits are required, provide justifications.

2.5. *Academic Performance Review Statistics*

• Provide a table showing the data identified in IV, Page 22. Required PRC Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review Academic Performance review Statistics (data produced by Institutional Research)

• Provide an analysis of enrollment (FTES & majors) trends, SFR, % of courses and FTES taught by regular faculty, other relevant information

• Discussion of the impact of these statistics on the program and its quality

3. Five-Year or Accreditation-Cycle Plan

This is the plan for the next 5 years or the next accreditation cycle. For each of the following 4 areas, include 1) action/change, 2) timeline, 3) person(s) in charge, & 4) estimated cost.

3.1. *Curriculum*

• Envisioned changes for the next five years or the next accreditation cycle, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment; online offerings, and General Education

3.2. *Students*

• Envisioned changes of trends for the next five years or the next accreditation cycle, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment, including, but not limited to the following issues:

o Number of majors
o Total enrollments
o Student characteristics
o Student career opportunities
o Program-level student learning outcomes
o Outreach plans
o Advising and retention strategies
o Class scheduling
o New or changes to programs
o Resources to support student learning

3.3. *Faculty*

• Envisioned changes for the next five years or the next accreditation cycle, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment

• List and justify anticipated new tenure-track applications

• Climate issues, leadership-faculty communication, workload challenges, advising plans

3.4. *Other Resources*

• discuss envisioned changes for the next five years or the next accreditation cycle, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including lessons from assessment, including, but not limited to the following:

o Staff
o Equipment
o Library
o Travel funds
o Information/instructional technology; assistive technology
o Other resource needs

4. External Reviewer(s)' Report

5. Program Response to External Reviewer's Report

Appendices

Examples might include the following:

a) Program/course assessment plans that illustrate your self-study report
b) Details on program requirements, as appropriate
c) List of current course offerings
d) Statistical data that is referenced in the self-study
e) Statements from resource providers, e.g., library liaison, IT, facilities
f) Documentation about faculty output, e.g., resumes, list of publications, etc.

CHAPTER 9 - REQUIRED PRC FIVE-YEAR OR ACCREDITATION CYCLE REVIEW ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE REVIEW STATISTICS

To accommodate the unique structure of a program or the interdisciplinary nature of a program, department chair/program director may consult with the PRC to make appropriate modifications concerning the type of data to be supplied for this section. For example, data on courses offered outside of the program (such as cross-listed courses) might be included if appropriate. Furthermore, some programs may have a student service component in addition to its academic programs. In such cases, additional data may be supplied. The data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research.

a) Student demographics of declared majors, minors, options and certificates:
- number and % of undergraduate and graduates by ethnicity and sex
- number and % of certificate students by ethnicity and sex
- number and % of first-time freshman by ethnicity and sex
- number and % of new transfer students by ethnicity and sex

b) Student level of majors for the past five or past accreditation cycle Fall terms:
- headcount of undergraduates, graduates, post-baccalaureate, and certificate students (if applicable)
- number and % of part-time undergraduates, graduates, post-baccalaureate, and certificate students (if applicable)
- number and % of full-time undergraduates, graduates, post-baccalaureate, and certificate students (if applicable)
- Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) of and % of part-time undergraduates, graduates, post-baccalaureate, and certificate students (if applicable)

c) Faculty and academic allocation:
- headcount and percentage of total of full-time faculty and part-time faculty
- headcount and % of total of tenure-track and lecturer faculty
- number of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)
- Student—Faculty Ratio (SFR) of tenure-track faculty, lecturer faculty, and total faculty
- SFR by lower division, upper division and graduate division

d) Course and degree data:
- number of sections offered, % of total classes, and average section size (student credit hours by level e.g., 100, 200, …, 700) of lower division, upper division and graduate division courses taught by tenure track faculty
- number of sections offered, % of total sections, and average section size (student credit hours by level e.g., 100, 200, …, 700) of lower division and upper division and graduate division courses taught by lecturers
- number of sections and average section size (student credit hours by level e.g., 100, 200, …, 700) of all courses
- number of degrees awarded for undergraduate and graduate students for the past five college years.
- % of sections offered with enrollments less than 20 in undergraduate classes and less than 10 in graduate classes (excludes individualized instruction).
- department/program budget allocations
- program costs
  - faculty costs
  - support staff costs
  - operations

CHAPTER 10 - PRC FORMAT FOR RESPONSE TO FIVE-YEAR OR ACCREDITATION CYCLE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Eastern Washington University

DESIGNATION CODE: [year] PRC [number]
DATE SUBMITTED: [insert date]

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: The Program Review Committee (PRC)
SUBJECT: Five-Year Program or Accreditation Cycle Review for [insert program]
PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate
ACTION
REQUESTED: [insert request]

PRC Analysis of the Program's Five-Year Review
  • Program
          1.
          2.
          3.
          etc.
  • Resources
          1.
          2.
          3.
          etc.

PRC Recommendation(s) for Continuation of the Program

Date of the Program's Next Five-Year or Accreditation Cycle Review

CHAPTER 11 - PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

In September 1984 the Council for Postsecondary Education (CPE), which has evolved into the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC), adopted a policy requiring all programs at state four-year institutions of higher education to undergo periodic review following specific guidelines. Summaries of the results of those reviews are to be reported to the WSAC which, in turn, reports to the governor and the legislature.

The Program Review Committee (PRC), a committee of the Academic Senate, was established to coordinate the Academic Program Review process. The membership of the PRC is:

- Nine (11) faculty with three-year terms, two (2) selected from each of the College of Arts, Letters, and Education, the College of Business and Public Administration, the College of Health Science and Public Health, the College of Science, Health and Engineering, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Social Work, and one (1) selected from the Library, whose appointments are confirmed by both the Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs Council;
- Two (2) students with one-year terms, one (1) undergraduate and one (1) graduate student, appointed by the ASEWU;
- One (1) administrator appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs;
- The Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Education, Grants, and Institutional Research (ex-officio member and convener of the meetings);
- The chair of the PRC is elected from the faculty membership.