WOODBURY UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE

Academic program reviews document that academic programs are vigorous and lead help the university achieve the goals of its mission, that they lead to student success, that they have high quality, that they seek continuous improvement, and that the resources that they generate or use are in keeping with all those goals.

The faculty and administration have developed academic program review procedures that encourage self-study and planning within programs and strengthen connections among the strategic plans of the program, the college, and the university, to document the evaluation of student learning goals as a key indicator of program effectiveness and to provide information for curricular and budgetary planning decisions.

WHO IS REVIEWED

An academic program is any coherent grouping of courses that elaborates a sequence of learning experiences. In this way, all majors are academic programs, but so are minors, general education curricula and curricula devoted to the development of specific skills and knowledge, such as writing, math, and design foundations.

HOW IS IT STRUCTURED

Because review is a part of self-reflective practice that can trigger institutional decisions, it has the following components:

- Self-study, which includes and internal and external environmental scan encompassing the life-cycle of the students from matriculation into at least the early stages of their careers, as well as recommendations for improvement
- Review and recommendations of outside evaluators, when appropriate;
- Review and recommendations by the Educational Planning Committee;
- Final approval by the school dean and the vice president of academic affairs of all elements of the program review documents;
- Review and approval by the President and Board
- Implementation of actions to improve program effectiveness in accordance with the review.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Each academic program has an identified program faculty and dean who are responsible for overseeing the academic program. On notification of the dean of the appropriate school by the vice president of academic affairs, the dean institutes a process involving department chairs and faculty in a meaningful and thorough review of the program.

With their chairs, program faculty are responsible for developing expected student learning outcomes for each of the programs listed and for employing annual methods to evaluate program effectiveness in achieving programmatic student learning goals. The assessment of these goals forms the core of the academic program review. (Although connected with program review, assessment of student learning at the classroom level resides with the individual faculty member and is not a formal element of the review.)

Overall administrative leadership in support of developing programmatic learning outcomes lies with the college deans with support from the vice president of academic affairs. Support for assessment should come from the Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the Educational Planning Committee.

TIME FRAME

At Woodbury University, programs are reviewed on a six-year cycle. This schedule may also be accelerated at the discretion of the vice president of academic affairs, the school's dean, departmental chair, or in compliance with recommendations from prior academic program reviews. Programs accredited by a disciplinary accrediting agency are reviewed in accordance with the review cycle established by the agency, not to exceed ten years.

Requests for delaying a review are initiated by the department chair/program administrator to the dean, who determines whether or not to advance the recommendation. The decision to delay a review rests with the vice president of academic affairs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the academic program review, the dean and the Educational Planning Committee recommend to the vice president of academic affairs one of the following:

- Recommended for continuance with endorsement of planned improvements.
- Recommended for continuance with conditions.
- Recommended for suspension.

The President and Board make the final determination.

STRUCTURE OF SELF-STUDY REPORT & CRITERIA

    I.   **Mission, Objectives, and Institutional Fit**
       a. Program Mission
       b. Program Objectives
       This criterion concerns what the faculty wish the program to accomplish. (*The review will offer evidence that the program has reached its objectives and make recommendations for improvement*.)

      c. Program Student Learning Outcomes
- i. List the learning outcomes for students majoring in the program.
- ii. Describe how achievement of each of these learning goals is evaluated and documented.
- iii. Describe changes the program faculty has made as a result of evaluation.

      d. Fit with Institutional Mission

II. The Changing Environment that Affects the Program
Describe actions taken in response to the recommendations made in the previous academic program review. Describe program and field changes over the past seven years and how the curriculum was revised to address these changes.

      a. Enrollment Trends
Describe and evaluate enrollment trends and student characteristics in the program for the past seven years. Provide an analysis of the program's success in recruiting, retaining, and graduating students. Describe the program's student-faculty ratio and FTES target trends and plans.

      b. Trends in the professions, markets, etc.

      c. Trends in education

III. Curriculum and Instruction
- i. Describe the program's curriculum.
- ii. Describe issues/challenges related to the scheduling of courses in order to meet student program needs.
- iii. Describe the program's role in providing service courses to other majors and the general education program and how successful these courses are in supporting the university's general education goals.

IV. Resources Within the Department, School, and University

      a. Faculty in the program
- i. Describe faculty expertise for covering the breadth of the program's curriculum, including deployment of full and part-time faculty, released time, and reimbursed time from grants/contracts, anticipated retirements, and other faculty issues.
- ii. Describe how faculty members are engaged and supported in scholarship, research, and/or creative activity.
- iii. Describe support for and involvement in faculty development, especially new and non-tenured faculty.
- iv. Describe the effectiveness of student advising and mentoring and involvement with student majors.

      b. Faculty in other programs

      c. Space

      d. Funding

      e. Support personnel and offices

V.   **Improvement Plan**
The program chair and faculty develop a plan for improvement that reflects the findings of the self-study. The plan should link the program the fulfillment of the program's goals to those of the school and university. The proposed plan should serve as a guide to the activities of the program for the subsequent seven years.

The plan should include (but is not limited to) the following elements:
1. Key recommendations of the program faculty resulting from the self-study.
2. Anticipated student profile in terms of number and type of students over the next five to seven years.
3. Action steps to be taken in order to achieve each of the recommendations and student enrollments over the next five to seven years.
4. Types of human, fiscal, and physical resources needed to implement enrollment projections and recommendations and curricular adjustments.
5. How the plan will be monitored and how it will be updated from year to year.

CHRONOLOGY

The process follows this chronology to ensure meaningful review, timely review and feedback, and timely submission of academic program review reports to the President and the Board of Trustees.

By January 15. The vice president of academic announces to the college deans and department chair/program administrator the programs to be reviewed one year prior to the completion date of the self-study, recommendations, and implementation plan.

By February 1. The department chair/program administrator for accredited programs requests of the college dean a substitution for the academic program review document.

By February 15. For accredited programs, the college dean determines whether the accreditation review process fulfills the academic program review.

By March 1. The deans of the schools identify who will lead the academic program review process.

By March 1. The deans of the schools that are conducting program reviews conduct a workshop with the department chairs, faculty, and others responsible for the academic program review. They present the academic program review process and disseminate data provided by institutional research, as required for the academic program review.

By January 31. The program chair submits to the dean the self-study document including recommendations and a preliminary plan for improvement.

By February 28. The dean invites an external evaluator to reads the self-study and visits the campus. The external evaluators will be individuals of significant professional reputation in the field who will report their findings to the appropriate department and school. Evaluators should preferably come from institutions within California. The dean is responsible for the selection of the evaluator and the overall coordination of the external review. The external evaluator's report will become part of the permanent academic program review file.

By March 30. The program resubmits to the dean the self-study document, modified appropriately in response to the external evaluation.

By May 31. The EPC and the vice president of academic affairs have received and reviewed the documents and the appropriate recommendations. The whole is submitted to the President.

At the October Board Retreat or the Board meeting prior to submission to an accrediting agency. The final report/review is presented to the Board of Trustees with a summary by the dean of the school. The academic program review documents are archived by the Office of Academic Affairs and are posted on the web (program self-study document, college recommendations, program faculty's final implementation plan, and the vice president's recommendation for program continuance/discontinuance).

By January 31. The program representative(s), the department chair/program administrator, the dean of the school, and the vice president meet to discuss the results of the academic program review and the preliminary implementation plan.

Ongoing. The dean of the school incorporates the results of the academic program review into the college's strategic and budget planning processes and forwards to the vice president as part of the regular planning process within academic affairs and within the university's strategic planning processes.

Appendix 1

Accredited Programs

For programs subject to professional, disciplinary, or specialized accreditation, academic program review is coordinated with the accreditation or re-accreditation review cycle. The self-study developed for professional or specialized accreditation reviews normally provides the essential requirements of academic program review and may, therefore, be used for this purpose, with approval by the dean of the school, the chair of the EPC, and the vice president of academic affairs.

The department chair requests of the college dean a substitution of the accreditation reports for the academic program review document. A copy of the accreditation standards and procedures must accompany that request.

A request for the accreditation document to serve as the self-study document is normally acceptable if both of the following criteria are met:

1. The program will undergo a comprehensive assessment as part of a state or national accrediting organization's review; and
2. the procedures and standards of the accrediting organization are judged to be comparable to those of the academic program review.

If the dean of the school determines that the standards submitted by the department's accreditation, taken as a whole, provide a level of quality comparable or superior to the program review criteria, the dean may make one of the following recommendations:

1. Approval as full equivalent.
   The accreditation self-study report, the team findings, and the accrediting agency's final report may be submitted in lieu of the academic program review and will follow the same course of review and recommendation as the academic program review.
2. Approval as partial substitution.
   The accreditation self-study report, the team findings, the accrediting agency's final report, and along with whatever other materials are required for a complete academic program review (e.g., assessment of student learning goals, implementation plan) are submitted according to the academic program review procedures and follows the same process for review and recommendation.

The recommendation of the dean goes to the EPC, who review the recommendation. The final decision remains in the hands of the vice president of academic affairs.

Appendix 2
Academic Program Review Data

The following data should be collected, analyzed, and summarized by the office responsible for institutional research on an ongoing basis. For each program undergoing review, data should be provided.

ENROLLMENT DATA (Six Year History)
- Student enrollment (major, minor, concentration, options, emphases–as available)
- Student diversity (ethnicity/gender/age)
- Student retention rates
- Degrees awarded
- Full-time Equivalent Student (FTES) targets and FTES achievements
- Student/faculty ratio

FACULTY DATA (Six Year History)
- Full-time faculty
- Part-time faculty
- Full-time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)
- Faculty released time

CURRICULUM DATA (Six Year History)
- Course enrollment history
- Student credit hour generation
  - By students majoring in the program
  - By courses in the program

SURVEY DATA (Six Year History)
- Graduating senior survey
- Alumni survey

OTHER
Data unique to each program's learning goals as requested by the Dean of the School

Appendix 3
Schedule for Reviews

DATE TO BEGIN	PROGRAM
January 2007	
January 2008	
January 2009	
January 2010	