HANDBOOK OF
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Notation: This document was drafted by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness for consideration by the appropriate faculty governance structures. The document was approved by the faculty in Spring 2018.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

Program Review is a vital process at the University of Saint Katherine (USK) and within higher education in general. It provides the opportunity for us to demonstrate our educational effectiveness to ourselves, our students, our accrediting agency, and the various communities we serve. Like assessment, program review is a process that benefits by the tradition of faculty governance and leadership to employ objective information useful for decision-making at every level of the institution. Consequently, program review is an essential, systematic, and periodic process in which all academic programs participate[1]. It remains critical we invest adequate time and energy into this shared requirement.

This handbook sets forth the standards and procedures governing the USK academic program review process. It stipulates the common program review process for all academic programs. Program review and this handbook are also designed to address both Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior Commission (WSCUC) accreditation standards, as well as elements unique to USK (for example, faith integration).

 "A program is defined as a systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses, forming a considerable part, or all, of the requirements for a degree or credential; [it] may refer to the total educational offering of an institution" (WASC Handbook of Accreditation, 2013). For purposes of program review, the following guidelines will be used to schedule program review: at the graduate level[2], all programs offering a degree are subject to independent program reviews; at the undergraduate level, all majors and stand-alone minors are subject to independent program reviews; undergraduate programs that share more than 50% of their curriculum with another program may request permission to conduct a joint program review. All requests for exceptions are filed with the appropriate chairperson and administrator.

Formal program review is based on and must incorporate an academic program's systematic and on-going assessment. Simply put, all program reviews must adequately reflect the assessment activities completed in the years prior to the review report.

1.1. Program Review Assumptions

Three basic assumptions underpin program review at USK:

1. Program review is a faculty-governed, comprehensive assessment and evaluation process that incorporates qualitative and quantitative evidence (data) to support assertions made in the written report. Unsupported assertions or comments are discouraged.

2. Quality is not easily defined or evaluated. Nevertheless, quality is *indicated* through such things as demonstrated student achievement, faculty accomplishments, curricular design, resource management, and ongoing planning, assessment, evaluation, and program improvement.

3. Program review is a self-examination process designed to assist academic departments in improving their academic programs and better serving their students. Consequently, vigorous and candid analysis, with a focus on program improvement, must characterize all program reviews. Programs using self-

---

[1] Note that this references academic program review, which is conceptualized apart from administrative unit review.
[2] USK does not have graduate-level programs at the time this document was developed, but this information will be used for academic planning purposes in the event of approved substantive or structural changes.

congratulatory language and/or claim excellence in all areas will have difficulty meeting this important assumption.

1.2. Purpose for Program Review

Program review enables USK, through its organizational units, and their departments, to examine the effectiveness of all its academic programs—to strengthen and maintain the university's curriculum within a faith-based context, by generating and pursuing informed recommendations related to student learning, program design, faculty effectiveness, and resource allocation processes aimed at achieving the university's Academic Vision outlined collectively in the Strategic Plan.

On a more pragmatic note, systematic program review is a process required by the regional accrediting agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior Commission (WSCUC).

All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations (2013 WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation, CFR 2.7)

> **IMPORTANT: In conjunction with the strategic planning process,** program review offers the program and/or department faculty the opportunity to make the case, if needed, for additional resources. Assessment evidence collected in the years preceding the review provides data to justify decision-making and resource allocation.

1.3. Accountability for Program Review

Program review is a faculty-governed and university-owned process. As such, there are a variety of constituencies who have accountability to the process.

The USK faculty are responsible for determining program review standards, as well as reviewing and evaluating current academic programs to ensure that those standards are met.

Designated staff in the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE) are responsible for providing data to programs **and** working with the faculty to coordinate the overall program review process or provide guidance on meaning-making and interpretation of the data. Specifically, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness serves as the administrative contact for the program review process by helping departments connect annual assessments with the program review cycle, collaborating with programs to provide the most accurate and meaningful data, sending out program review notifications, receiving and distributing program review reports, maintaining the program review master schedule, monitoring the various program review processes, and archiving past program review reports. Close communication among programs and the Director is vital to sustaining an efficient and clear program review process.

The program's department chair and the full-time faculty in the program undergoing review share the responsibility for conducting the review and preparing a report. The department chair may organize and accomplish the review in a manner she/he thinks most appropriate, but retains the overall responsibility for completing the review on schedule. All full-time program faculty should be involved in and able to discuss the results of program review prior to its final iteration submitted for evaluation by an external evaluator.

The administration of the university is responsible for reviewing program reviews and determining the budgetary and resource support that is available to the program, as well as utilizing program review reports to inform strategic planning and budgeting at the department, college, and university levels.

1.4. Clarifying Program Review Committees and their Work

Program Review Committee (PRC)
Each chairperson oversees the program review process for its respective academic level by selecting a standing Program Review Committee (PRC), which consists of at least one member who chairs the committee and whose membership must meet the qualifications as described below. Together, the PRC is responsible for evaluating the quality of each Program Review Report and the quality of the academic program, as well as for providing a recommendation to accept or not accept a program review final document.

Program Review Committee Membership Criteria
The guidelines for PRC membership are identified below:
- Due to the size of USK, committee membership ought to include no less than **2** and no more than **5** members, with no more than **2** members from any one department or program.
- At least one PRC member (the chair) must come from the Faculty Senate. Other qualified PRC members may be selected from faculty at the same level within or outside the Faculty Senate.
- Ex-officio members may be appointed by the Faculty Senate or PRC as needed. Additionally, programs undergoing review may request the addition of a specific faculty member from an outside department to join the team reviewing their specific program.
- Per WSCUC guidelines, one PRC member should have expertise or training in outcomes assessment, in order to evaluate the quality of student learning outcomes and assessment strategies utilized by the program undergoing review (note: the external reviewer, if utilized, or a specially appointed faculty member may serve in this role).

Authority of the Program Review Committee
Each PRC is charged with assessing and documenting the effectiveness of the program curriculum at its level to ensure that program goals are being met. This charge is carried out via program review. In this regard, the PRC has the authority to request edits to a Program Review Report when the submitted work fails to address required components of the report, provides incomplete or inaccurate information, reaches faulty conclusions, or fails to identify appropriate goals in light of the evidence provided in the report. In all cases, requests for edits are made through the lens of program improvement and should be clearly communicated in a timely and collegial fashion. These edits are requested prior to any formal evaluation of the report and should not be included as part of the PRC's final report (see below) unless they remain unaddressed by the program. Once requests for edits have been made by a PRC, a program may choose to respond by making requested edits or by providing further rationale for the contents of the report. No more than two weeks should transpire between a PRC request for edits and the submission of a revised report.

Communicating the Results of Program Review
Once a program has responded to the request for edits and submitted its final version of the Program Review Report, the PRC completes the Program Review Committee Report and Rubric for Assessing Program Review Reports (see Appendices A and B). In these documents, PRCs are expected to comment, with recommended action steps, on the quality of the written report, the quality of the academic program, and the appropriateness of

the program's goals. The PRC may also identify goals it believes may facilitate program improvement in the future but may not require action by the program as a contingency for approving a program report.

To clarify its analysis, the PRC utilizes the Rubric for Assessing Program Review Reports (Appendix B). While an assigned score for each component is requested, a PRC may choose not to assign scores but to categorize each component under one of the four descriptors (e.g., emerging, developed, etcetera).

As part of the communication process, the PRC is required to formally present its findings and recommendations to the program undergoing review, through a face-to-face meeting with the program faculty or other program representative. At the program's request, students may also be invited to this event. Programs have opportunity at that time to correct errors of fact before the PRC report is sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion. If, after the face-to-face meeting, there are disagreements related to a PRC recommendation, a program representative or constituent may request, in email to the Chair of the Senate, the opportunity to appear at the next Faculty Senate meeting when the program review is scheduled for Faculty Senate action and may ask for intervention to remedy the disagreement. The Faculty Senate will summarize the request in writing, hold discussion, make a ruling, and immediately note its action as part of the minutes of the meeting.

The Faculty Senate receives a PRC's final report and rubric, along with the recommendation to accept or not accept the program review, and then votes to approve or request resubmission, which is communicated to both the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and to the University President.

Once the review is approved by the Faculty Senate[3], all program review materials are sent by the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness to the Chief Academic Officer. The Chief Academic Officer reviews all relevant materials and meets one-on-one with program faculty to share his/her perspective. Following the face-to- face meeting, the Chief Academic Officer records his/her official findings in the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding. The completed Administrative Response (see Appendix C) and Memorandum of Understanding (see Appendix D) are then returned to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness who will catalog the materials with the remaining program review documents. Once the program reviews for an academic area are complete, the Chief Academic Officer will meet with the President to summarize findings or any other relevant information. In conjunction with the strategic planning process, program review materials are considered by President's Cabinet to inform budgeting and strategic planning decisions.

Mid-Cycle Status Reports
It is the purview of the PRC to ensure that programs have evaluated their progress towards meeting identified goals by reviewing their Mid-Cycle Status Report and presenting their evaluation of the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

Making Changes to Program Review
In addition to review of each program, the PRC and its Faculty Senate may also recommend, review, and propose changes to this program review handbook and template. To accomplish this, all proposed program review changes are sent in advance to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the Chief Academic Officer who then hold discussion with the Faculty Senate. Following a review period not to exceed 3

---

[3] If a program is not approved by the Faculty Senate, a meeting with the program faculty, Chief Academic Officer, Faculty Senate chair and PRC chair is scheduled to resolve differences. In rare instances, the Office of the President may be asked to render a final decision.

weeks, a joint Faculty Senate meeting takes place to vote on the recommended changes to the program review process. The meeting is scheduled and must be attended by the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, who serves in a voting capacity, and must include the entire membership of the Faculty Senate. All changes to program review are finalized at the meeting and recorded in the meeting minutes. Changes are implemented by the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and resubmitted to the Faculty Senate for adoption.

1.5. Program Review Cycle

Academic programs are scheduled to conduct a program review and write a report on a seven-year rotating cycle, or concurrent with external professional accreditation (see 1.6. below), with a Mid-Cycle Status Report due 3 years from the date the report was prepared. New programs are scheduled for review following an initial five-year developmental period. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness) maintains the Program Review Master Schedule, in consultation with the department chairs and their PRCs. The schedule is a flexible document and undergoes changes from time to time. (The current schedule is available on the OIRE link on the USK website). Requests for extensions or changes to the Program Review Master Schedule must be approved by the Faculty Senate and Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Changes are not final until reflected on the Program Review Master Schedule and reposted to the OIRE link above.

> *Extensions on Program Review Reports do not result in altering the long-term Program Review Master Schedule. Programs which are granted an extension must still meet the date/year the next program review is due.*

1.6. Program Review and External Accrediting Agency

When possible, academic programs with external professional accreditation[4] are scheduled for an USK program review in close proximity to the production of their professional accreditation documents. Generally, programs which have produced accreditation reports are scheduled for a program review within six (6) months of that time, so that they may use their professional accreditation report as the primary basis of the USK Program Review Report. In order to create consistency in reporting and ease of review by peers, disciplinary accredited programs are asked to "cut and paste" the appropriate sections of their professional accreditation documents into the USK report template. In rare cases, the program may be granted permission to use the professional accreditation report in lieu of the USK program review template. In such cases, the submitted documents would still contain the standardized table of contents from the report template, clearly identifying where each of the USK-required data exhibits and response items are located in the professional accreditation report. Additionally, if any USK program review components or requirements are not included in the accreditation report, the program must provide this additional information in the USK Program Review Report.

1.7. Program Review External Reviewers

Academic programs *not* accredited by a specialized accrediting agency are required to utilize an outside (external to USK) reviewer who reviews program materials and submits a written analysis as part of the review process. In the spring prior to the program review, the department chair is responsible for identifying a qualified

---

[4] At the time this document was approved, USK currently does not offer academic programs with professional accreditation. Nevertheless, the language is included to align academic planning efforts with program review policies.

reviewer and completing the External Reviewer Request and Authorization Form (see Appendix E). Stipend amounts for the external reviewer are recommended by the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness to the Chief Financial Officer, but the typical stipend ranges from $500.00 to $1,000.00. All travel expenses for bringing the external reviewer to campus are to be covered from the program's budget, unless negotiated differently with the Chief Financial Officer. Once a reviewer is selected and approved, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness manages the necessary paperwork for hiring the external reviewer (see Appendix F).

According to standards proposed by the WASC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review, external reviewers should meet the following criteria:

- Distinguished scholar/teacher/practitioner in the field or holds evidenced expertise in the area undergoing the review
- When possible, chosen from a campus similar to USK
- When possible, experienced with program administration
- When possible, experienced with assessing student learning outcomes
- When possible, familiar with USK's mission and purpose

External reviewers are selected in advance of program review but are utilized only after the review has been written. Although the Program Review Report is read in its entirety, the external reviewer focuses on Components A-E and may request additional materials from a program in order to: **1)** review curricular offerings for relevance, currency, and quality; **2)** review the appropriateness and effectiveness of strategies used to assess student learning and other program outcomes; **3)** ensure decisions and actions taken by the department/program, based on assessment, are in keeping with best practices in the academic discipline; **4)** evaluate the quality of faculty teaching and breadth of faculty scholarly activities and accomplishments; **5)** evaluate the program's effectiveness at recruiting and retaining successful students; and **6)** provide an evidence-based analysis of the program's strengths and areas in need of improvement relative to comparable programs. External reviewers must visit USK in order to verify materials that are referenced by the program and to interview faculty, students, and administrators in order to obtain the most accurate information. Campus visits should be scheduled within 4 weeks of receiving a program's materials (unless over winter or summer), and the report should be submitted within two weeks of a campus visit.

The external reviewer completes the External Reviewer Report (see Appendix G), as well as the Rubric for Assessing a Program Review Report (Appendix B) and submits it to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, who then forwards it to the department chair/program director and the Program Review Committee (PRC) members to be included as part of the Program Review Report.

1.8. Timely Completion of Program Review

All attempts are made by the university to support the timely completion of program reviews. In addition to having access to the 7-year Program Review Master Schedule, programs are notified of the impending review and given their program data in the spring prior to the fall due date. Because the university is striving to incorporate program review results into the strategic planning and budgeting processes, it is in a program's best interest to complete the review by the date assigned, so that the identified needs may be considered in this process.

When a department or program fails to complete its required program review within the expected time limits, sanctions may occur. At the Faculty Senate level, the program may be placed on moratorium and not permitted to bring curricular proposals or other matters before the appropriate Faculty Senate until the report is approved by the PRC. Programs submitting late reviews will not be granted extensions on the subsequent review due date but will be expected to complete their next review as scheduled.

2. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Program review is a systematic process completed in five phases: 1) preparing for the program review, 2) writing the report, 3) reviewing and evaluating the report, 4) responding to the findings of program review, and 5) reporting on the progress following the review. The process is described below and is also summarized with timelines in Table One and via flow chart in Appendix I.

2.1 PHASE ONE: Preparing for the Program Review

Phase One begins when the department receives notification from the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, during the preceding fall semester, that they are scheduled to complete a program review during the fall semester of the _next_ academic year. The Chief Academic Officer of the school or college in which the program resides also receives notification.

The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRE), ensures that the department chair/program director has a copy of the Program Review Handbook and Program Review Report Template (also available at www.USK.edu/OIRE) and all data necessary for analysis. Data not yet available will be identified and a plan for securing that data will be communicated to the program. In some cases, complete data will not be available and programs may need to supplement required tables with their own data.

Soon after notification of review, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will set up a meeting with the department chair/program director to:
- Discuss the review process
- Clarify requirements for the written report
- Make clear any assistance provided in preparing, conducting, and reporting the review
- Discuss the projected timeline for completing the program review
- Help the program develop a strategy for completing the review and meeting the expected due date

For non-accredited programs, the department chair/program director and faculty will identify a qualified external reviewer and acquire appropriate approvals for hiring him or her (see Section 1.7 for details).

Programs are strongly encouraged to begin the program review process in spring so that reports can be submitted on time in the fall.

2.2 PHASE TWO: Writing the Report

The program faculty, in consultation with the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and OIRE, complete the Program Review Report Template (under separate cover), submitting an electronic copy to the

Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, who then sends an electronic copy to the chair of the program review committee. For non-accredited programs, the external reviewer also completes her or his report and submits it to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Programs should allot at least one month prior to submission of the final report for the department chair and Chief Academic Officer to review the final draft (see Table One for "The Program Review General Timeline"). Prior to submission to the director, the department chair and/or the program director, all full-time faculty teaching in the program, and the school/college Chief Academic Officer sign the final draft of the Program Review Report. Signatures from the faculty and the Chief Academic Officer signify a working knowledge of the program review findings but do not authorize the review as approved. Studies Faculty Senates are the bodies authorized to approve program reviews, after which the Chief Academic Officer will provide an official response with a Memorandum of Understanding (see Phase Four).

2.3   PHASE THREE: Reviewing and Evaluating the Report

Upon receipt of the finished and signed report (as well as the External Reviewer Report), the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness ensures that a copy has been received by the members of the PRC so they can evaluate the quality of the report. Interim requests for edits by the PRC are made in a timely fashion (see Section 1.4). Once final edits are made, the PRC completes the Program Review Committee Report (Appendix A), attaches the Rubric for Assessing Program Review Reports (Appendix B), and presents its findings back to the program faculty. It then makes a recommendation to the appropriate Faculty Senate whether or not to accept the report.

The Faculty Senate votes on the recommendation of the PRC, thereby making a final decision on the program review, and minutes reflecting action on the program review are forwarded to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the Senate. Once Faculty Senate approval is acquired, all updated materials are forwarded to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, who then forwards the materials and the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding to the Chief Academic Officer for an official response (see Phase Four below).

2.4   PHASE FOUR: Responding to the Findings of Program Review

After the Program Review Report is completed and approved by the appropriate Faculty Senate, an administrative response and Memorandum of Understanding process is initiated.
The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness forwards completed and approved program reviews, with the PRC Report, and attaches a copy of the Administrative Response (Appendix C), and Memorandum of Understanding (Appendix D) to the Chief Academic Officer of the school/college undergoing review. After receiving the PRC report and its recommendations in the Spring following the review, the Chief Academic Officer meets with the program undergoing review to discuss findings and then responds with written feedback and budget allocations (as appropriate) for accomplishing the program goals, with recommended action steps. As appropriate, the Chief Academic Officer incorporates program goals into the school's/college's strategic plan so that long-term resource needs are addressed as part of the budgeting process. The Chief Academic Officer returns her or his completed Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness for further dissemination.

Following the Chief Academic Officer's response, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness forwards fully executed copies to the Chief Academic Officer, department chair, and program director of the program undergoing review.

Responses from the Chief Academic Officer are sent to the appropriate vice President so that they may be considered by President's Cabinet when making long-term academic resource allocations, and decisions by TAC are communicated back to the Chief Academic Officer.

2.5   PHASE FIVE: Reporting on the Progress of the Review

On behalf of the appropriate PRC, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness initiates and facilitates the Mid-Cycle Status Report process. Assuming that interim deadlines are met by all parties involved during the academic year of review, Mid-Cycle Status Reports are due at the conclusion of the fall semester that falls 3 years after initial reports are written and 2.5 years after they are reviewed by the administration. This gives programs two academic years to start implementing changes and six months to evaluate the effectiveness of those changes.

The primary purpose for the Mid-Cycle Status Report is to describe the short-term progress made in implementing the identified program goals with recommended action steps and to re-visit the administrative response. The department completes the Mid-Cycle Status Report (Appendix H) and submits it to the Chief Academic Officer for a response and signature. Once the Chief Academic Officer has responded, the Mid-Cycle Status Report is sent to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, who forwards the document to the PRC chair.

The PRC reviews and comments on the Mid-Cycle Status Report. If the report is acceptable, this fact appears in the PRC's minutes sent forward to the appropriate Faculty Senate for approval, and the report is filed with the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness also distributes the report to the chair of the PRC and to the department chair and program director of the program submitting the report.

As a part of the ongoing process of assessment, all academic programs continue to assess student learning outcomes and engage in strategic planning on an annual basis. These annual processes serve to inform the next program review.

3. Components of the Program Review Report

The following is a brief overview of the components required in the Program Review Report. These components meet WASC criteria as identified in the WASC Resource Guide for 'Good Practices' in Academic Program Review (2009) and represent best practices in higher education assessment.

Programs are not expected to have fully achieved maximum quality for all the components, but instead, the review should address each component with a thorough, evidence-based, and accurate analysis.

The overall structure of the Program Review Report is articulated below but does not contain all the elements required of programs. The Program Review Report Template is available under separate cover and must be used as the basis for the document provided by each program under review.

3.1 Cover Sheet, Faculty/Chief Academic Officer Verification and Table of Contents

The report starts with an identifying cover sheet, followed by a verification page with faculty and Chief Academic Officer signatures and a table of contents, identifying the starting location of each major component.

3.2 Response to the Components

Programs will utilize multiple years of program data to evaluate the quality with which their program operates as it relates to each of eight components, briefly described below. (See Program Review Report Template for the full description of program review components.)

NOTE: **The information for the data exhibits identified in Components B-E will be provided to the fullest extent possible by the OIRE, in the form of a completed table, which may be inserted into your report. Data collection for faculty and student enrollment will end by November 1 for faculty and October 15 for students of the year prior to the submission of the report. Programs may choose to update data beyond November 1 or October 15 of the year prior to the submission of the report. Data collection for student completion, GPA, and class size will end by June 30 of the year prior to the submission of the report. Programs may need to supplement the tables with information unavailable to the OIRE. In such cases, programs must specify collection methods and dates (or date ranges).**

Component A - Mission and Context
Programs will describe where the program fits within the university structure (e.g., school/dept.) and what degrees or concentrations it grants. The program's mission and purpose, and how it helps to fulfill the broader mission of USK will be discussed. Trends in higher education as they relate to the need for the program will be identified. Evidence collected from the last program review (or the program's inception), as well as the strategic planning process, will be described and evaluated as a context for beginning the current review.

Component B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications
Programs will evaluate the academic preparation and qualifications of faculty who teach in the program, as well the scholarly accomplishments that have contributed to program quality. Teaching effectiveness across delivery systems will be evaluated in light of the faculty development opportunities and mentoring available to faculty. Distribution of workload and course distribution across faculty classification will be analyzed in terms of overall program effectiveness.

Component C - Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning
A thorough analysis of the curriculum requirements and the degree to which the curriculum adequately and thoroughly addresses program student learning outcomes is required in this section. Programs will evaluate their effectiveness at communicating outcomes to students and involving them in the assessment process and will also evaluate the effectiveness of their assessment cycle to improve student learning.

Component D - Student Enrollment and Success
Programs will evaluate the program's ability to attract students who fit the program mission and who successfully graduate from the program. Student and alumni accomplishments will be identified as indicators of program success, and enrollment trends will be discussed as they relate to successful recruitment and retention. Programs will evaluate the effectiveness of services they provide to facilitate

student success.

Component E - Academic Opportunities and Class Size
Using data provided, programs will evaluate the size of their classes and the use of special study options available to students and will discuss how each impacts program quality.

Component F - Student and Constituent Feedback
Programs will report any data and feedback that have been provided from students, alumni and/or supervisors as to the program's ability to prepare successful graduates. Additionally, the program will discuss ways in which student, alumni, and supervisor feedback is utilized in the assessment of program quality, as well as the program's effectiveness at communicating and responding to the results discovered during program review.

Component G – Faith Integration
Programs will identify the support and assistance provided to both students and faculty so that they develop an appropriate understanding of how the Orthodox Christian faith interacts with the discipline. Programs will evaluate evidence of adequate progress toward these goals.

Component H – Resources and Institutional Capacities
Programs will engage in a resource and capacity analysis as it relates to use of past resources, as well as resources still needed by the program. Budget trends will also be analyzed.

3.3 Summary Conclusions, Program Goals with Recommended Action Steps

The process of identifying program goals is the culminating phase of academic program review and the starting point for the next review period. Its purpose is to identify an action plan in such a way that progress toward implementing the plan can be assessed for the next round of program review. Programs will provide summary conclusions as to the program's areas of strength and need for improvement based on the program review and will identify specific goals with recommendations for making necessary change. Recommendations will include an associated action or outcome that needs to occur in order to meet the goal. The Chief Academic Officer will respond to this analysis.

3.4 Appendices

The following appendices are required as attachments to the program review. Others may be added as necessary.
- Program Goals with Recommended Action Steps from prior Program Review Report
- Mid-Cycle Status Report
- Administrative Response to Program Goals and Memorandum of Understanding from prior Program Review Report
- Overall Multi-year Assessment Plan
- Annual Assessment Reports (since the last program review)
- Strategic Plan and Status Reports Since Last Review

3.5 External Reviewer Report

Non-accredited programs must utilize an external reviewer who evaluates the program as a supplement to the PRC (see Section 1.7 for more detail). The external reviewer's report (see Appendix D) must be submitted to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, which forwards the report to the PRC reviewing the program.

3.6 Program Review Committee Report with Rubric

PRC members will complete a report (see Appendix A) and utilize a rubric (see Appendix B) to communicate the overall quality of the program review. After reporting its findings and recommendations to the program faculty, the PRC will forward its recommendation to the Studies Faculty Senate for official action on the program review.

3.7 Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding

Once approved through faculty governance processes, the Chief Academic Officer will respond by completing the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding (see Appendix C and D), providing an analysis of resources available to accomplish program recommendations.

3.8 Mid-Cycle Status Report

Programs complete a brief report, updating progress made toward achieving program recommendations. The Mid-Cycle Status Report is typically due 3 years following an approved program review report and is reviewed by the Chief Academic Officer and PRC.

Table One: The Program Review General Timeline

	No later than	Task or Process
PHASE ONE: **Preparing for Review** ● Fall/Spring semester prior to Program Review	November 1	Programs scheduled for upcoming review are notified by the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and begin working with programs to collect alumni data.
	May 15	Members of OIRE and the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness meets with the department chair/program director to determine needs, communicate expectations, and provided all available university data.
PHASES TWO through FOUR: **Preparing and Approving the Report; Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding** ● The academic year in which the Program Review is completed	June 15	Department/program selects and receives approval for hiring an external reviewer (if applicable). Department begins organizing for program review.
	December 15	Program faculty provides materials to external reviewer and completes the Program Review Report. **Programs should allow at least one month prior to December 15 for Chief Academic Officer's review.** Program Review Report, with Chief Academic Officer's signature, is submitted to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness; report is distributed to the members of PRC.
	March 15	PRC examines the report and the external reviewer's report, asks for interim-level edits (when necessary) and reports its findings to the program. PRC then makes a recommendation (accept or not accept) to the associated Faculty Senate.
	April 15	Faculty Senate votes on recommendation to accept or not accept and records its actions in the Faculty Senate minutes, which are approved and forwarded to the Senate and the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.
	June 15	The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness sends finalized materials to Chief Academic Officer for the Administrative Response and Memorandum of Understanding. Chief

		Academic Officer meets with program to discuss findings, potential resource allocations, and completes Memorandum of Understanding. Program reviews are referenced by academic administration in future budgeting discussions.
PHASE FIVE: **Mid-Cycle Status Report and Continuous Assessments** ● Post-Program Review	Two years following report approval	Programs continue to assess student learning outcomes and engage in strategic planning annually. Programs implement recommendations with action steps and assess the effectiveness of program changes.
	December 15 (3 years following review)	Programs submit a Mid-Cycle Status Report identifying progress made toward achieving program goals, as well as any challenges that still remain. Chief Academic Officer and PRC reviews and responds.

Appendix A
Program Review Committee Report

Name of Program Reviewed: _____

Directions to Program Review Committee: In the table below, comment on the quality of responses given by the program for each component, the quality of the academic program, the appropriateness of goals and action steps identified by the program, and any recommendations for the program to consider in its Mid-Cycle Status Report. Provide feedback that is evaluative and clear. This report will be sent to the program as part of the feedback loop prior to final vote by the Faculty Senate.

Component of Report	**Quality of Report Score from rubric**	**Quality of Report: PRC response to analysis provided by program (comment in terms of the criteria in the rubric) and PRC response to program goals and action steps identified in this component.**	**Quality of Program Score from rubric**	**Quality of Program: PRC evaluation of program quality (comment in terms of the criteria in rubric). Include additional recommendations for program improvement that should be addressed in Mid-Cycle Status Report**
A - Mission and Context				

B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications			
C - Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning			
D - Student Enrollment and Success			
E - Academic Opportunities and Class Size			
F - Student and Constituent Feedback			
G - Faith Integration			
H - Resources and Institutional Capacities			
Summary Conclusions and Overall Score			

Summary statement from PRC regarding the quality of the program review (including commendations and recommendations):

Summary statement from PRC regarding the quality of the program (including commendations and recommendations):

Final recommendation of Program Review Committee (circle one): accept   do not accept

Date: _____

Vote by Faculty Senate to (circle one): approve   deny program review

Date: _____

Appendix B

RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING A PROGRAM
(Refer to Section 1.4 for guidelines for appropriate use of rubric)

Note: Fractional scores (e.g., 2.7, 3.5, etc.) are acceptable but not required

Area/Component	Initial 1	Emerging 2	Developed 3	Highly Developed 4
A. Mission and Context	Missing or vague mission statement. Fails to link program mission to USK. Inadequate justification for program existence and/or failure to address program changes since last review. Inadequate analysis.	Functional mission statement; contains abstract language or ideas that are hard to assess but generally linked to USK mission. Superficial discussion of trends related to program demand. Incomplete discussion of changes since last review. Incomplete analysis.	Good mission statement that is linked to USK mission. Solid discussion of program trends in higher education. Thorough discussion of changes since last program review. Good analysis.	Well-crafted mission; clear and succinct and visibly linked to USK mission. Thorough and educated discussion of program trends in higher education. Complete assessment of changes since last program review. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Record comments in PRC Report: Report Quality Score: _____				
B. Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications	Quality of Report: Missing most or all information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and/or workloads. Teaching effectiveness data missing; failure to address faculty resources or faculty	Quality of Report: Includes some information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads. Addresses teaching effectiveness and faculty resources, but an incomplete analysis.	Quality of Report: Nearly all information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads is included. Data and analysis of teaching effectiveness provided but not clearly linked to	Quality of Report: All information on faculty demographics, qualifications, productivity, and workloads is included. Data and analysis of teaching effectiveness provided, along with thorough discussion of faculty resources and

	needs. Inadequate analysis.		resources/mentoring. Good analysis.	faculty needs. Excellent, insightful analysis.
	Quality of Program: Levels of faculty scholarship and/or teaching effectiveness are insufficient to support the program. High student-faculty ratio, percentage of courses taught by adjuncts, and/or faculty workload undermines program effectiveness. Insufficient faculty racial or gender diversity for this program.	Quality of Program: Levels of faculty scholarship and/or teaching effectiveness are marginally able to support the program. An imbalance in student-faculty ratio, percentage of courses taught by adjuncts, and/or faculty workload hinders program effectiveness. Faculty racial or gender diversity for this program is in need of attention.	Quality of Program: Levels of faculty scholarship and/or teaching effectiveness adequately support the program. Appropriate student-faculty ratio, percentage of courses taught by adjuncts, and/or faculty workload contributes to program effectiveness. Faculty racial or gender diversity appears appropriate for this program.	Quality of Program: High levels of faculty scholarship and/or teaching effectiveness contribute to the strength of the program. Student-faculty ratio, percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty, and/or faculty workload leads to program quality and exceeds expectations. Faculty racial or gender diversity within this program exceeds expectations.
Record comments in PRC Report: Report Quality Score: _____ Program Quality Score: _____				
C. Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning	Quality of Report: Incomplete overview of course offerings.	Quality of Report: Provides an overview of course offerings and degree	Quality of Report: Provides an overview of course offerings	Quality of Report: Provides an overview of course offerings

No mention of alignment with comparable programs. No curriculum map or discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Little to no assessment of curriculum effectiveness or process used to assess curriculum. Inadequate analysis.	requirements with limited references to comparable programs. Incomplete curriculum map and limited discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Limited discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Incomplete analysis.	and degree requirements and discusses alignment with comparable programs. Includes a curriculum map and thoughtful discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Good analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Good analysis.	and degree requirements and engages in a thorough discussion of how program aligns with comparable programs. Includes a curriculum map and thoughtful discussion of student learning outcomes and how they are communicated to students. Excellent analysis and discussion of assessment process used to assess curriculum. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Quality of Program: Student learning outcomes are not behavioral or measurable or are inappropriate for the program level. The program does not appear to gather data on best practices in the discipline or compare themselves to comparable	Quality of Program: Student learning outcomes are not fully developed across the program, with little evidence of alignment between curriculum and SLOs. There is some recognition of best practice in the field, but not a regular process for examining comparable institutions or disciplinary exemplars. Students appear unacquainted with SLOs and are not fully meeting	Quality of Program: Student learning outcomes are stated in behavioral and measurable terms, are aligned across the curriculum with program competencies, and are communicated to students. Faculty engage in discussions of best practice,	Quality of Program: Student learning outcomes are stated in behavioral and measurable terms and the curriculum map clearly indicates the progression of each outcome across the program so that students have adequate opportunities to develop and master

institutions or programs. Curriculum does not appear to be aligned with SLOs. SLOs are not communicated to students. Students do not appear to be meeting program outcomes. Faculty do not use feedback on SLOs to improve the learning experience.	program competencies/outcomes. Faculty occasionally examine outcome data to improve the student learning experience, but not on a regular and consistent basis.	comparable programs in their discipline, and use outcome data to improve the student learning experience. Most students appear to be meeting the program outcomes.	each competency. Students are consistently meeting and/or exceeding virtually all program learning outcomes. Faculty regularly examine outcome data, best practices in the discipline, and comparable programs in other institutions in order to continually improve the student learning experience.

Record comments in PRC Report: Report Quality Score: _____   Program Quality Score: _____

D. Student Enrollment and Success	Quality of Report: Missing most or all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment missing or incomplete. No mention of	Quality of Report: Includes some demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment exists but is incomplete and not evidence-based. Brief mention of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Incomplete analysis of	Quality of Report: Includes nearly all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment is discussed but not exceptionally	Quality of Report: Includes all demographic and enrollment data. Information on student diversity, accomplishments, degrees awarded, time to graduation, and/or student/alumni accomplishment is well-documented and discussed. Thorough

organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Missing analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Inadequate analysis.	student recruitment and retention strategies. Incomplete analysis.	documented. Thorough discussion of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Good analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Good analysis.	discussion of organizations, assistance, and/or services to students with special needs. Thorough and thoughtful analysis of student recruitment and retention strategies. Excellent, insightful analysis.
Quality of Program: Student enrollment trends do not support the viability of this program. There does not appear to be a good fit between the students and the demands of the program. Insufficient diversity exists within the student body. Retention and graduation rates indicate few students experience success and/or timely degree completion. Student and alumni achievements are	Quality of Program: Student enrollment trends indicate concern about the future viability of this program. There are some concerns about the fit of students for this program. Student diversity is in need of improvement. Retention and graduation rates indicate lower levels of student success and timely completion than is desired by the institution and/or the program. Student and alumni achievements appear to be lower than expected for the program level.	Quality of Program: Student enrollment trends indicate sustainability of the program, with appropriate fit of students to program mission. Student body is sufficiently diverse to support the learning goals of the program or institution. Retention and graduation rates appear appropriate for program level or institutional selectivity. Student and alumni achievements meet	Quality of Program: Student enrollment trends indicate a strong future for this program, with a well-articulated recruitment and retention strategy that attracts diverse students who are a good fit for the mission of the program and institution. Retention and graduation rates indicate students are experiencing high levels of success and timely degree completion, with a high level of

	unknown or unremarkable.		program and/or institutional expectations.	achievements reported by current students as well as alumni.
Record comments in PRC Report:	Report Quality Score: _____		Program Quality Score: _____	
E. Academic Opportunities and Class Size	Quality of Report: Missing most or all information on special study options, class size, and/or non-credit courses. Little or no evaluation of how study options and class size impact program quality. Inadequate analysis.	Quality of Report: Includes some information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses, but no evidence-based discussion of impact on program quality. Incomplete analysis.	Quality of Report: Includes nearly all information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses. Solid discussion of impact on program quality. Good analysis.	Quality of Report: Includes all information on special study options, class size, and non-credit courses. Evidence-based discussion of impact on program quality.
	Quality of Program: Class sizes hinder student learning and program effectiveness. There are insufficient academic opportunities to support student learning outcomes or the proportion of special study options appears to hinder program quality.	Quality of Program: Class sizes appear inappropriate for program level and mission and may hinder program effectiveness. Academic opportunities are not sufficiently aligned with program objectives or student learning outcomes to contribute to program quality.	Quality of Program: Class sizes are within an appropriate range to support student learning and program quality. Academic opportunities appropriately support student learning and program quality.	Quality of Program: Class sizes contribute to high levels of student learning and program quality. Academic opportunities are well aligned with program competencies and student learning outcomes and contribute to program quality.

Record comments in PRC Report:	Report Quality Score: _____		Program Quality Score: _____
F. Student and Constituent Feedback	Quality of Report: Program does not gather student and alumni feedback for program improvement. Students know little or nothing about the overall outcomes of the program.	Quality of Report: Some references to information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, but limited or no use of supervisor assessments. Recognition of need to include students in program review, but efforts to date are minimal. Incomplete analysis.	Quality of Report: Good discussion of information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, and solid attempt to utilize supervisor assessments. Some processes in place for including students in program review. Good analysis.	Quality of Report: Excellent discussion of information from student satisfaction or alumni surveys, as well as systems for utilizing supervisor assessments. Systematic processes in place for including students in program review. Excellent, insightful analysis.
	Quality of Program: Class sizes hinder student learning and program effectiveness. There are insufficient academic opportunities to support student learning outcomes or the proportion of special study options appears to hinder program quality.	Quality of Program: Program gathers student and alumni feedback but does not implement information to make programmatic improvements. Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Student and constituent feedback indicates the program is not yet meeting student expectations of quality	Quality of Program: Program gathers student and alumni feedback and uses data to make program improvements. Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Student and constituent feedback indicates the program is meeting	Quality of Program: Students are aware of the program competencies and have been involved in the program review process. Student and constituent feedback indicates the program is exceeding expectations.

			student expectations of quality.	

Record comments in PRC Report: Report Quality Score:_____   Program Quality Score:_____

G. Faith Integration	Quality of Report: Missing most or all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and/or evidence of faith integration among students. No data from IDEA provided or discussed. Inadequate analysis.	Quality of Report: Includes nearly all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and evidence of faith integration among students. Limited reference to data from IDEA, but an incomplete analysis.	Quality of Report: Includes nearly all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and evidence of faith integration among students. Solid discussion of IDEA results and other sources of evidence. Good analysis.	Quality of Report: Includes all information on departmental assistance provided, faith integration scholarship, and faith integration among students. Excellent discussion of IDEA results and other sources of evidence. Excellent, insightful analysis.
	Quality of Program: There is no evidence that the faculty and	Quality of Program: There is insufficient support provided to faculty and students for	Quality of Program: Appropriate support is provided to faculty	Quality of Program: Strong support is provided to faculty

	students in the program are meeting the faith integration expectations of the university.	faith integration. Faculty and/or students do not yet demonstrate sufficient progress in meeting the faith integration expectations of the university.	and students for faith integration. Faculty and students demonstrate appropriate progress in meeting the faith integration expectations of the university.	and students for faith integration. Faculty and students' progress in faith integration exceed the expectations of the university.

Record comments in PRC Report: Report Quality Score: _____   Program Quality Score: _____

H. Resources and Institutional Capacities	Quality of Report: Fail to discuss adequacy of library resources or needs around information literacy. No substantive analysis of efforts toward resource acquisition or evidence-based need for new capacities. No discussion of budget trends. Inadequate analysis.	Quality of Report: Minimal discussion of library and information literacy needs. Mention of resources acquired but lacks a thorough analysis of need for new capacities. No meaningful discussion of budgetary trends. Incomplete analysis.	Quality of Report: Solid discussion of library and information literacy needs. Good discussion of resources acquired and reasonable analysis of need for new capacities. Budgetary trends are discussed. Good analysis.	Quality of Report: Excellent discussion of library and information literacy needs. Thorough discussion of resources acquired and excellent, evidence-based analysis of need for new capacities. Budgetary trends are thoughtfully and thoroughly analyzed. Excellent, insightful analysis

Quality of Program: There is no evidence that library resources, budget, or institutional capacities contribute to program effectiveness. Resources are inadequate or there is no information provided about them.	Quality of Program: Library resources, budget, and/or institutional capacities are insufficient for continued program effectiveness.	Quality of Program: Library resources, budget, or institutional capacities appear to adequately support program effectiveness.	Quality of Program: The program has demonstrated resourceful and innovation in securing the library resources, budget, and/or institutional capacities necessary to support program effectiveness.

Record comments in PRC Report: Report Quality Score:_____   Program Quality Score:_____

Area/Component	Initial 1	Emerging 2	Developed 3	Highly Developed 4
Conclusions, Goal Setting with Recommended Action Steps	Missing a summary of strengths and weaknesses generated from program review. Goals are ambiguous and action steps are unattainable. Inadequate analysis.	Includes a brief summary of strengths and weaknesses but still superficial. Goals are adequate but not evidence-based and action steps are not clear or attainable. Incomplete analysis. Goals are not well aligned with	Includes a thorough discussion of strengths and weaknesses. Goals are reasonable and attainable and action steps make sense. Good analysis.	Excellent and articulate discussion of strengths and weaknesses. Goals are clearly linked to program improvement and are reasonable. Action steps are clear. Excellent, insightful analysis.

		areas in most need of improvement.		

Record comments in PRC Report:	Report Quality Score: _____	Program Quality Score: _____

Appendix C
Administrative Response

(Attach *this* year's Administrative Response Sheet as Template Appendix B for your program's *next* program review.)

Program: _____ **School/College:**
_____

Date Approved by the Program Review Committee:
_____

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO GOALS* - In the Chief Academic Officer's column in the table below, respond with feedback to *each goal and, when appropriate,* identify any resources that are available or any form of assistance you can provide for accomplishing a program goal. After meeting with program faculty to discuss your response, please return this form, and accompanying Memorandum of Understanding to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

Specific Goal or Desired Outcome to Improve Program Quality (copy or summarize from program report)	Program's Recommended Action Steps to Achieve Goal (copy or summarize from program report)	Program's Request for Resources with Justification (include costs and rationale)	Priority of Resource Allocation (High, Medium, Low.)	Anticipated Impact on Educational Effectiveness	Chief Academic Officer's Response to Goals (see instructions above)

* If a Program Goal is a request for a new program initiative, contact the Office of Curricular Support (OCS)

Additional Comments from Chief Academic Officer on these Goals and Recommended Action Steps:

Chief Academic Officer's response to the PRC's Findings and Recommendations:

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER'S ANALYSIS OF RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS: In the space below, using data from Exhibits B.7, C.1, D.2, and H.3 and annual strategic planning reports, analyze current resource allocations for this program in light of enrollment trends and/or revenues.

To what degree are requests for new positions or space justified by increased enrollments (C.1)?

Does the faculty/student ratio (B.7) and average class size (D.2) justify the need for more resources?

What evidence is provided to indicate that resources will impact the educational effectiveness of this program?

How do the requests noted relate to the shared vision 2022, the Academic Vision 2012, and your school/or college strategic plan?

Chief Academic Officer's Signature:_____
             Date:_____

Program Chair/Director Signature:_____
Date:_____

*UPON COMPLETING THIS RESPONSE SHEET, please make a copy for your records and then return this original *immediately* to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

DATE RECEIVED BACK to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness:
_____

Appendix D
Memorandum of Understanding

Program: _____ **School/College:** _____

Date Review Approved by the Program Review Committee:_____

Date of Meeting Between Chief Academic Officer and Program Faculty: _____

Chief Academic Officer's Commendations:

Chief Academic Officer's Recommendations:

Chief Academic Officer's Commitment to Resources and/or Support Allocation:

Chief Academic Officer's Signature:_____
         Date:_____

Program Chair/Director Signature:_____
         Date:_____

Date of Meeting between President and Chief Academic Officer: _____

President's Comments:

President's Signature: _____   Date: _____

*UPON COMPLETING THIS MOU, please make a copy for your records and then return this original *immediately* to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

DATE RECEIVED BACK to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness:

_____

Appendix E
External Reviewer Request and Authorization Form

Name of Program Undergoing Review: _____

Name and Title of Proposed Reviewer: _____

Current Place of Employment: _____

Provide a brief biographical statement that clearly indicates the qualifications of the reviewer. Please also attach an updated vita.

Explain any prior or current relationship with the program and/or program faculty/students that may create a conflict of interest (e.g., has the reviewer previously taught for USK? Is he/she currently involved in a business or professional relationship with a member of the program? Are there other professional/personal relationships between any member of the program and the proposed reviewer?)

Projected Expenses: Identify with detail the projected expenses for utilizing this reviewer (Note: whenever possible, a qualified local reviewer and a one-day site visit is preferred):

Travel:
Meals:
Stipend:
Other:

Submitted by: _____
               (Name and title of faculty making request)

Approved by: _____
               (Department chair)

Approved by: _____
               (Chief Academic Officer)

Approved by: _____
               (President)

Funding amount approved by President: $_____

Return this completed form to the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will send a completed copy to the President and will initiate the hiring of the external reviewer.

Appendix F – External Reviewer Professional Services Agreement

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAINT KATHERINE
(Herein referred to as USK)
EXTERNAL REVIEWER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT
A completed W-9 must accompany this form[1]

External Review:	_____	SSN or Fed I.D. #:	_____
Street Address:	_____	Department:	_____
City, ST, Zip:	_____	USK Account #:	_____
Contract Start Date:	_____	Contract End Date:	_____
Contract Amount:	_____	Description of Service:	External Program Review

1. Engagement of External Reviewer. USK hereby engages External Reviewer and External Reviewer hereby agrees that during the Term of this Agreement External Reviewer shall provide reviewing of program consistent with the USK Program Review Handbook and including but not limited to the constructive evaluation of the Program Review Report submitted by the program faculty. The External Reviewer may choose, but is not required, to conduct a site visit as part of the review. The External Reviewer must provide within ten (10) working days of the site visit or the receipt of a Program Review Report (whichever occurs last) a written evaluation of the program using the guidelines provided and attached hereto.

2. Compensation. USK shall pay External Reviewer for services for the contract amount set forth above. Such compensation shall be paid in semimonthly installments on the 1st and 16th of each month within the parameters of the above given contract dates. At the end of the calendar year, USK will issue an IRS Form 1099 to Professional, and External Reviewer shall be responsible for making all required tax payments.[1]

3. Independent Contractor Status; Authority. The relationship of External Reviewer to USK is that of an independent contractor, and not an agent, servant or employee of USK. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to imply that External Reviewer or its agents or employees are officers or employees of USK. External Reviewer shall not be authorized to enter into any contracts, agreements or understandings on behalf of USK without the prior written consent of USK except as specifically provided for herein.

4. Confidentiality. In connection with the consulting relationship established pursuant to the terms of this Agreement, External Reviewer may have access to non-public information regarding University and its students. External Reviewer agrees to keep such non-public information confidential, and shall not, without the prior written consent of the USK Office of the President, disclose such information in any manner whatsoever, in whole or in part, or use such information other than in connection with the performance of external reviewing services pursuant to this Agreement. Promptly, upon completion or termination of this Agreement, all copies of the confidential information will be returned to USK or destroyed upon the request of USK.

5. Governing Law and Jurisdiction. This Agreement shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. Each of the parties hereto consents to such jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Agreement and matters pertaining to the transaction and activities contemplated hereby.

6. Complete Agreement. This Agreement supersedes any and all agreements, either oral or in writing, between External Reviewer and USK with respect to the subject matter contained herein. Each party to this Agreement acknowledges that no representations, inducements, promises or agreements, oral or otherwise, have been made by either party and that no oral agreements or understandings between the parties shall be binding upon them.

7. Compliance with USK Policies. External Reviewer agrees to abide by the policies and behavioral standards of USK, as indicated in the USK Employee Handbook, USK Faculty Handbook, and USK Adjunct Handbook, indicating their understanding and acceptance of such standards.

Print Name of External Reviewer	Date
Signature of External Reviewer	Date
Department Chair Approval	Date
Chief Academic Officer's Approval	Date
USK President Approval	Date

Appendix G – External Reviewer Report Template

EXTERNAL REVIEWER REPORT
Prepared by: [insert name and title]
[insert institution]

For [insert name of program being reviewed]

Completed on: [insert date]

Note: The following pages constitute the template for all External Reviewer Reports. Do not change the order or the wording of any items and respond where indicated. External Reviewers may request additional information from departments or programs in order to complete their analysis of the program.

Routing of the Program Review External Reviewer Report

ACTION ITEM	DATE ACTION OCCURS (notify OIRE at each step)
☐ In the spring prior to the review, once approvals have been obtained, program sends the external reviewer a professional services agreement and the external reviewer report template.	
☐ No later than December 15, the program director submits their program review report and any additional documents to the external reviewer.	
☐ Within two weeks of receipt of the program's materials, the reviewer reads the materials and may complete a campus visit (extensions may be granted if timeframe encompasses a university holiday).	
☐ Within two weeks of the campus visit, the external reviewer forwards an electronic copy of the report to the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness in OIRE and to the program director.	
☐ The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness forwards the report to the Program Review Committee chair. The PRC reviews the External Reviewer Report and incorporates its findings into their PRC Report.	
☐ After the program review has been approved by the Faculty Senate, The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness sends final Program Review Report, the PRC Report & scoring Rubric, the External Reviewer Report, the Administrative Response, and the Memorandum of Understanding to Chief Academic Officers.	
☐ The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness keeps copies of all program review materials.	

Table of Contents

Component A - Mission and Context
Please review and evaluate the program's mission and purpose. Discuss the need for the program within the context of higher education and evaluate its apparent contribution to the academy and society at large. Where appropriate, identify ways for the program to improve its relevancy.

[Respond Here]

Component B - Faculty Characteristics and Qualifications
Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the quality and quantity of faculty associated with the program. Identify any needs related to faculty that impact delivery of a high-quality program, and identify any gaps or weaknesses that should be addressed.

[Respond Here]

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's, doctoral). Where appropriate, suggest improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality of scholarship produced by the faculty.

[Respond Here]

Component C - Quality of Curriculum and Student Learning
After reviewing the program's curricular offerings, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any needed changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

[Respond Here]

Component D - Student Enrollment and Success
Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program's recruitment and retention efforts as it relates to enrolling and graduating students who fit the mission of the program. Identify any areas in need of improvement for producing successful students, especially as it relates to meeting the needs of diverse learners.

[Respond Here]

Component E - Academic Opportunities and Class Size
Using the evidence provided, discuss the trends in the program's class sizes and, if relevant, the impact on student learning and program effectiveness. When applicable, comment on areas in need of improvement as it relates to academic opportunities provided by the program.

[Respond Here]

Component F - Student and Constituent Feedback
Analyze the department/program's overall effectiveness at utilizing student, alumni, and supervisor feedback as part of the assessment process. How well does the program solicit and respond to feedback, as well as communicate results of program review to its constituents, especially its current students? In what ways can the program improve in its use of constituent feedback?

[Respond Here]

After reviewing the Multi-year Overall Assessment Plan of the program, please evaluate the quality of the plan, including the appropriateness of the evidence used to assess student outcomes. Comment on any areas needing improvement related to outcomes assessment.

[Respond Here]

Component G - Faith Integration
Evaluate the program's commitment to the integration of faith and learning. When appropriate, identify areas in need of improvement.

[Respond Here]

Component H - Resources and Institutional Capacities
Comment on the internal and external resource allocations provided to the program, including University resources that support the program (e.g., University library, financial aid, student or faculty housing, etc.), as it relates to the program's enrollment trends and growth projections. In what ways can the program better allocate or acquire resources?

[Respond Here]

Summary Conclusions and Response to Program's Goals and Recommended Action Steps
Respond to the summary conclusions provided by the program and identify any additional findings from your own analysis of the program. Include a response to the program's goals and recommended action steps, identifying any additions or modifications that you deem appropriate to that list. Feel free to add any comments that further clarify your assessment of the program.

[Respond Here]

Appendix H
Program Review
Mid-Cycle Status Report
(to be completed by December 15, 3 years after initial writing of Program Review Report)

Program Name:

Date Program Review Report was approved by Faculty Senate:

Date Mid-Cycle Status Report Submitted:

Specific Goal or Desired Outcome to Improve Program Quality. (will be copied from original program review; include PRC recommendations)	Recommended Action Steps to Achieve Goal (copy from original program review report or strategic plan; include PRC recommendations)	Chief Academic Officer's Initial Response to Goals (from original program review or strategic plan)	Evidence or Outcome used to Evaluate Progress (what data are you using to make your judgment?)	Progress Made Toward Accomplishing Goal (be detailed when possible)

PRC's Recommendations from Original Program Review:

Additional Comments from Chief Academic Officer from Original Program Review:

RESPONSES:

Program Faculty Summary Conclusions: Evaluate how well the program is moving forward on its program goals, and identify any remaining challenges associated with accomplishing the recommendations from the original program review.

Chief Academic Officer's Response: In the space below, comment on the progress being made by the program and indicate any further considerations or concerns. Identify any actions necessary to support the program's achievement of its goals.

Chief Academic Officer's Analysis of Resource Allocations from Program Review Memorandum of Understanding. Evaluate the program's use of resources provided in the original MOU. What adjustments are necessary based on the program's progress?

Chief Academic Officer's Supplemental Response to MOU. Include any new commitments made as a result of this status report:

I have read and responded to this document: _____

Signature of Chief Academic Officer   Date

Program Review Committee Response: In the space below, comment on the progress being made by the program and indicate any further considerations or concerns.

Accepted by the Undergraduate, Masters, or Doctoral (circle one) Program Review Committee

PRC Chair:_____   Date:

Appendix I
USK – Program Review Process

PROGRAM REVIEW – A periodic event, usually every seven years, completed by academic departments/programs that includes assessment results plus other critical elements related to educational effectiveness.

1. In the fall, prior to a scheduled review, programs are notified and given opportunity for input on their Alumni Survey. Alumni Survey is sent out before Christmas

2. In the spring, programs meet with OIRE and OIRE team and are provided with their data. Non-accredited programs select and receive authorization for an external reviewer.

3. A completed Program Review Report is submitted by the program faculty to The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the corresponding Program Review Committee (PRC).

4. The PRC reviews the report, requests interim edits, responds with a report and presentation of findings to the program faculty and makes a final commendation to the Faculty Senate.

5. The Faculty Senate takes action on PRC recommendations and communicates its action to the Senate.

6. Once approved, The Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness forwards the program review materials to the Chief Academic Officer for a face-to-face meeting and a written Administrative Response with Memorandum of Understanding.

7. The department or program begins working toward accomplishing short-term goals.

8. During their quarterly strategic planning meetings, the Administrative Cabinet utilizes program reviews for prioritizing the academic budget and sends recommendations to The Administrative Cabinet at the appropriate time in the budget development process.

9. Decisions regarding long-term resource allocation are communicated to the appropriate Chief Academic Officer and department or program.

10. 3 years after completing its program review report, program faculty submit a Mid-Cycle Status Report commenting on progress made toward goal completion. The report is routed to the Chief Academic Officer and PRC for response.

USK PROGRAM REVIEW