

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Departmental Review Guidelines



January 2001

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	3
<u>Major Program Review Activities</u>	3
<u>Administrative Responsibility for Departmental Reviews</u>	3
<u>Frequency of Evaluations</u>	3
<u>Department Orientation</u>	4
<u>The Departmental Self-Study</u>	4
<u>The Review Committee</u>	4
<u>The Review Committee Report</u>	5
<u>The Response of the Dean and Department Head</u>	5
<u>The Joint Review Committee</u>	5

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	6
<u>Standard 1</u> - Departmental Mission & Goals, Planning & Effectiveness	6
<u>Standard 2</u> - Educational Program and Its Effectiveness.....	7
<u>Standard 3</u> - Students.....	10
<u>Standard 4</u> - Faculty.....	10
<u>Standard 5</u> - Administration.....	12
<u>Feedback Process</u>	12
<u>Reporting Cycle</u>	13
<u>Implementation Process</u>	13
<u>Ongoing Review of the Program Review Process</u>	13
Appendices:	
<u>Appendix A</u> : Committee Report-Suggested Format.	13
<u>Appendix B</u> : Schedule of Departmental Reviews.....	14
<u>Appendix C</u> : Program Evaluation Procedures and Time Lines.....	14

Introduction

The major purpose of the program review process is to stimulate self assessment that leads to improved scholarship, teaching and outreach. Such improvement should occur through (a) the recognition of effective departmental activities, and (b) the identification and modification of ineffective activities. Program review recommendations will focus on the quality and effectiveness of each major program of study within the department and teaching, research, extension, and professional service activities in the department. The program review process will be an on-going function of the program as data are continually collected and analyzed and adjustments incorporated based on the analysis.

Major Program Review Activities

The major data sources for each departmental review will be:

1. A departmental self-study.
2. An evaluation by a review committee or an accreditation team.

Administrative Responsibility for Departmental Reviews

Departmental reviews will be administered by the Provost's Office, with supportive services by other units where appropriate.

Frequency of Evaluations

All teaching, research, extension, and professional service activities in each department at Utah State University will be subject to review on a departmental basis at least once every seven years. When another national accreditation process or federal program review occurs, the results of that evaluation may be used in lieu of this additional review. To have another review accepted, the Department Head will work closely with the Provost to insure that the process, to include the self-study, exhibits and site visit will meet the goals of the departmental review.

As all programs within the department to include undergraduate and graduate programs must be reviewed, there are three possible scenarios that exist for departments. (1) All programs within department are reviewed by national accrediting agencies cycles no greater than every seven years. This department will prepare for their national accreditations and assist as necessary with the Commission on Colleges of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges review. Their review cycle for visits will reflect their accrediting agencies' calendar. (2) Some programs within departments are reviewed by national accrediting agencies, but others are not. In this case the department will prepare for their national reviews and simultaneously review the balance of their programs following these Departmental Review Guidelines. A schedule will be worked out that accommodates both the accrediting agencies cycle and the seven-year cycle. (3) No programs are reviewed by national accrediting agency. This department will review all programs following the Departmental Review Guidelines on a seven-year cycle.

Department Orientation

Before the appointment of the internal or external review committees, an orientation meeting will be held with the Provost, Assistant Provost, the Graduate Dean, and the

Department Heads of those departments scheduled for review. This meeting will occur approximately eighteen months before the scheduled review date. The purpose is to provide the departments with a general overview of the review procedures and potential evaluation criteria.

The Departmental Self-Study

The departmental self-study is the essence of the review process. The preparation of the self-study document requires that the department assess its performance in relation to its identified role and the program evaluation criteria listed in this document. Based upon this assessment, the department provides information to support the attainment of criteria. In cases where deficiencies exist, the department identifies courses of action to remedy deficiencies, or if major departures from standard indicators of productivity exist, the department justifies these departures. The self-study will constitute an in-depth self-appraisal of the department's activities by both faculty and students, based on continuing strategic planning, goal formulation, assessment, and decision making based upon assessment outcomes.

To the greatest extent possible, the University will support the department in its data collection efforts. Such support will include the development of common instruments that will reduce the data collection workload of the department and provide consistency in measurement across departments.

The Review Committee

The Review Committee will consist of at least one Utah State University faculty member and two nationally recognized experts in the program department under review. Review committee members will be selected by the Provost after nomination by the department, and after consultation with the College Dean(s) and the Graduate Dean.

Off-campus committee members will be selected from outside the state of Utah. Review committee members will not have close personal or working ties to department faculty members.

The role of the Off-campus reviewers will be to:

1. Spend a minimum of two full days on campus reviewing the department and meeting with appropriate members of the administration, students and alumni.
2. Make comparative judgements between USU and peer institutions relating to the department's curriculum, faculty, students, administration, and program resources.
3. Submit a draft report to the department within three weeks of the visit to campus.
4. Submit a final report.

The role of the On-campus representative will be to:

1. Maintain contact with the department during the preparation of the departmental self-study.
2. Meet with the faculty and students of the department as appropriate to gather additional data.
3. Work with the Off-campus committee members during their visit to campus.
4. Assist in the drafting of the initial committee report and in the preparation of the final report.

The Review Committee Report

All members of the Review Committee will analyze the departmental self-study, the additional data gathered, and draft a report making recommendations related to program improvement, continuation and discontinuation. (Appendix A provides the suggested format for this report.) The initial report should be submitted to the department so that any factual errors can be corrected.

The final report will be submitted to the Provost, with copies to the Department and to the Dean of the College.

The Response of the Dean and the Department Head

The Department Head and the Dean of the College will prepare a response to the final report as submitted by the Review Committee. This response should be in the form of a written document prepared either jointly or separately, and directed to the Provost.

Joint Review Committee

A Joint Review Committee will be appointed by the Provost. The committee will be composed of three department heads, the Graduate Dean and the Provost. Department heads will serve for three years and have staggering appointments. It is the responsibility of this committee to analyze all the Final Reports submitted by the Review Committee and the response(s) of the Dean and the Department Head, and to make findings and recommendations. The Joint Review Committee will also review the site-visit results of those departments with national accreditation for any of their programs.

The recommendations of the Joint Review Committee will be one of the following:

1. Department fully meets the criteria established for review.
2. Department partially meets the criteria established for review and needs to address the following deficiencies prior to the next review.
3. Department does not adequately meet the review criteria and is placed on probation and a complete review will be conducted in three years.
4. Department and/or programs are substandard and should be discontinued.

Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria are selected from the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC) Commission on Colleges' Accreditation Handbook. By addressing these criteria the department will fulfill the requirements for both the NASC and the Regents' Departmental Review process. It is not intended that each criterion will be of similar importance or apply to all programs in a department. The department will have an opportunity to suggest changes and additions to the criteria to better match the criteria to the department's role assignment.

The review data should cover all undergraduate, graduate, extension, and Life-Span Learning programs and activities in which the department is involved.

In preparing the self-study, the department shall demonstrate how it meets each standard. The self-study document should succinctly, thoughtfully, and analytically appraise the strengths, weaknesses, and achievements of each program relative to each standard. Data should be gathered and presented separately for each undergraduate and graduate program. Exhibits should be on the department's Web site, whenever feasible.

Standard One - Departmental Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

Standard 1.A - Mission and Goals

The institution's mission and goals are supported through the department's scholarship, teaching, and outreach activities, and its role within the university community.

1.A.1. Demonstrate that the role of the department relates to the mission and goals of the college and the University. Present the specific goals the department has set for itself and the process for meeting them. Indicate how success in meeting the goals is assessed.

1.A.2. Describe each program area within the department. Explain any unique or outstanding contributions these programs make to the mission and goals of the department and how they meet state and national needs.

1.A.3. Present and discuss any general strengths and weaknesses of the department. Show

how the strengths are being nurtured and how the weaknesses are being remediated.

Required Exhibits for Standard One

1. Statistical Profile (Budget Office)
2. Copy of Department Mission and Goals
3. Program information including admissions criteria, courses, etc.

Standard Two - Educational Program And its Effectiveness

Standard 2.A

The department offers quality programs that culminate in identified student competencies and lead to degrees or certificates in recognized fields of study.

2.A.1. Describe degree and certificate programs and demonstrate that they show a coherent design: that they are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, and sequencing.

2.A.2. Demonstrate that in each field of study or program, degree objectives are clearly defined including the content to be covered, the intellectual skills, the creative capabilities, and the methods of inquiry to be acquired; and, if applicable, the specific career-preparation competencies to be mastered.

2.A.3. Demonstrate that methods are in place to assess student proficiency in meeting the degree objectives. Describe the procedures and explain how the results are used.

2.A.4. Procedures for additions and deletions of courses and/or programs are systematically and periodically applied to the department offerings.

Standard 2.B - Educational Program Planning and Assessment

Educational program planning is based on regular and continuous assessment of the programs in light of the needs of the disciplines, and the fields or occupations for which programs prepare students.

2.B.1. Identify and publish the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. Through regular and systematic assessment demonstrate that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes.

2.B.2. Provide evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning. Describe how the assessment activities strengthen the program.

Standard 2.C - Undergraduate Program

The undergraduate program uses (1) general education which requires students to master competencies for independent learning and to develop an awareness of the fundamental areas of knowledge; (2) the major which requires students to achieve a knowledge base in a specific area of concentration; and (3) electives which provide the opportunity for students to pursue other intellectual interests to provide students with a substantial, coherent, and articulated exposure to the broad domains of knowledge.

2.C.1. Demonstrate that the program course of studies is structured to use general education courses as an opportunity to broaden students' exposure to broad domains of knowledge with the addition of electives for additional intellectual interests while the major provides the specific knowledge base for the area of concentration.

Standard 2.D. - Graduate Program

The graduate program is a set of advanced academic experiences beyond the baccalaureate level which must be satisfactorily completed to warrant the award of a graduate degree.

Graduate degree programs may generally be classified into two categories: those that prepare students mainly as scholars and researchers and those that prepare students for a profession. The objective of a research-oriented graduate degree program is to develop scholars that is, students with skills necessary to discover or acquire, organize, and disseminate new knowledge. The objective of the professional graduate degree is to develop in students their competence in interpreting, organizing, and communicating knowledge and to develop the analytical and performance skills needed for the conduct and advancement of professional practice.

2.D.1. Demonstrate that graduate programs are guided by well-defined and appropriate educational objectives and differ from undergraduate programs in requiring greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities.

2.D.2. Demonstrate that doctoral programs have a level of expectations, and curricula greater than those for the master's and baccalaureate programs.

2.D.3. Demonstrate that faculty working in graduate programs are related by training and research to the disciplines in which they teach and supervise research.

2.D.4. Demonstrate that in the delivery of off-campus programs, full-time faculty whose responsibilities include a major commitment to graduate education provide physical presence and participation in the planning, delivery, and assessment of the programs.

2.D.5. Demonstrate that faculty are adequate in number, sufficiently diversified within disciplines and actively engaged in research so as to provide effective teaching, advising, direction of scholarly and/or creative activity, as well as to participate appropriately in curriculum development, policy development, evaluation, institutional planning, and development.

2.D.6. Demonstrate that the doctoral degree program has a core of full-time faculty active in graduate education at its main campus and at each off-campus location where doctoral programs are offered.

Standard 2.E. Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities.

The changing nature of the demands placed upon individuals in today's society requires many of them to engage in life-long education. These opportunities take the form of continuing education, professional development, extension education, outreach, etc. Such programs may be for either undergraduate or graduate credit, or non-credit and may be offered on and off campus, and may be offered through a variety of instructional formats.

2.E.1. Demonstrate that where such programs are offered, full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the department's continuing education and special learning activities.

2.E.2. Demonstrate that where such programs are offered, programs and courses offered through electronically-mediated or other distance delivery systems provide ready access to appropriate learning resources and provide sufficient time and opportunities (electronic or others) for student to interact with faculty.

Required Exhibits for Standard Two

1. Instruments and procedures used to measure educational program effectiveness.
2. Inventory of documents that demonstrate the appraisal of educational program outcomes. Examples may include:
 - annual goals and assessment of success in their accomplishment
 - studies of alumni and former students
 - Studies regarding effectiveness of programs and their graduates test comparisons
 - surveys of student satisfaction
3. Statement of degree objectives for each undergraduate and graduate degree program.
4. Current and complete syllabi of all courses. (or Web-site address)
5. Changes made as a function of assessment.

Standard Three - Students

Standard 3.A

Students are admitted based on appropriate criteria and monitored throughout the

program. There is evidence of a need for the programs as demonstrated by the student demand as well as placement of graduates.

3.A.1. Provide evidence of student demand and demand for graduates.

3.A.2. Show that procedures for recruiting of quality students in adequate number are responsible and ethical.

3.A.3. Demonstrate that admission requirements are publicly disseminated and fairly applied and that students admitted to programs meet the admission standards.

3.A.4. Show that students are monitored to ensure that remediation, transfer, or termination occurs in a timely and humane manner.

3.A.5. Demonstrate that completing students have the skills and knowledge necessary for the field of preparation. Follow up studies are conducted on completing students.

Required Exhibits for Standard Three

1. Recruitment plans and procedures

2. Admission requirements and data on student admissions.

3. Advising procedures and materials, such as student handbooks.

4. Assessment of student performance throughout the program and at completion.

5. Samples of student work and/or publications.

6. Student satisfaction data.

7. Follow-Up data on graduates regarding placement and acceptance at graduate schools, licensure, and/or test results.

Standard Four - Faculty

Standard 4.A

Faculty selection development and retention is of paramount importance to the department. Faculty performance in teaching, scholarship, research, service, and artistic creations is regularly evaluated. Providing for the faculty development on a continuing basis is apparent.

4.A.1. Demonstrate that the department employs professionally qualified faculty with a primary commitment to the institution. Show that faculty are representative of each field or program in

which the department offers major work.

4.A.2. Demonstrate that faculty participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising and institutional governance.

4.A.3. Demonstrate that faculty performance is regularly and systematically reviewed to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities.

4.A.4. Show that part-time and adjunct faculty are qualified by academic background, degree(s), and/or professional experience to carry out their teaching assignment and/or other prescribed duties and responsibilities.

4.A.5. Show that teaching within the department is of high quality as evidenced by evaluations, reviews and observations by peers, students, and administration. Show that results are used to improve the teaching performance within the department.

4.A.6. Show that faculty are engaged in scholarship, research, and artistic creation based on specific role descriptions. Show that students are involved in faculty activities when circumstances are appropriate

4.A.7. Demonstrate that opportunities for continued professional development are provided to the faculty as related to their role.

4.A.8. Show that faculty are recognized for contributions through awards and honors at the regional, national, and international levels.

4.A.9. Show that faculty participate in and receive recognition from their respective professional and governmental organizations through election to office, receipt of awards, appointment to editorial responsibilities, and participation in proposal review and program evaluation activities.

4.A.10. Show that faculty are successful in securing external funding.

4.A.11. Show that faculty are responsive to local and regional needs and are sought out for their expertise.

Required Exhibits for Standard Four

1. Current faculty curriculum vitae should be on file in the department office or available electronically.

2. Summaries of faculty review process for all faculty.

3. Summaries of teaching evaluations by students, peers and administration. Evidence that results are used to improve instruction.

4. Summaries of faculty achievements, activities, scholarly endeavors, external funding, professional development, service, etc.

Standard Five - Administration

Standard 5.A

The department administration provides opportunities for group planning with input from appropriate groups. Resources are used appropriately to meet the goals of the department.

5.A.1. Demonstrate the department is engaged in long and short term planning.

5.A.2. Demonstrate that faculty and students are involved in appropriate departmental decision making.

5.A.3. Demonstrate that departmental procedures for recruitment and retention of faculty are linked to departmental goals and planning.

5.A.4. Demonstrate that available resources are used wisely for the program operation.

5.A.5. Demonstrate that space allocations allow for programs and offerings to achieve the department's responsibilities and goals.

Required Exhibits for Standard Five

1. Documents showing long-and short-term planning.

2. Identify department goals and the process by which they are developed, assessed and renewed.

Feedback Process

After site visits have been completed and review reports submitted to the Provost's Office, information will be provided to each department regarding the findings and recommendations of the visit. This will include, but not be limited to, overall findings indicating effective practices that are in place as well as recommendations for improvement.

Reporting Cycle

Program review summaries along with institutional recommendations will be provided to the Board of Trustees for their review on a yearly basis. Program review summaries will also be reviewed by appropriate faculty and academic administrators at other USHE institutions and by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Implementation Process

It is necessary for all programs to address the evaluation criteria immediately. Therefore, those programs being reviewed in 2001-2002 will address them as outlined. Where programs are not in full compliance with the standards, a plan for meeting the standard will be included along with a time line. Programs being reviewed after the first year (beginning 2002-2003) will be expected to meet the standards as outlined.

Ongoing Review of the Program Review Process

Recognizing that program review and improvement is an on-going and evolving process the program review process should also be expected to evolve. Suggestions for improving the program review process will be solicited from the deans, department heads, and on-campus representatives involved in recent reviews. These suggestions will be reviewed by the Joint Review Committee and the process will be revised as needed. Deans will be consulted before such suggestions are incorporated.

APPENDIX A

Suggested Review Committee Report Format

1. Departmental description (approximately 1 page):
 - (A) Major programs of study in the departments:
 - (B) Size of department in terms of students and staff:
 - (C) The role and history of the department:
 - (D) Special facilities or activities managed by the department.
2. Review activities (approximately 1 page):
 - (A) The makeup of and major review activities conducted by the Review Committee.
3. Evaluation criteria. A short summary statement of the review information on each criterion:
 - (A) Mission and Goals
 - (B) Program Effectiveness
 - (C) Students
 - (D) Faculty

- (E) Administration
- (F) Resources and facilities (equipment)

4. Summary: departmental strengths and weaknesses.
5. Recommendations for specific changes.
6. Additional information. It would be extremely helpful if the following points were covered:
 - A. What is the state of the art in this discipline, and how well is it reflected in the department? How do the goals of the department compare to those of the rest of the profession?
 - B. What should be the roles of this department in the university? Is it successfully fulfilling these roles?
 - C. How does the quality of this department compare with departments elsewhere in the areas of teaching, scholarship, students, and outreach?
 - D. Given the resources at hand, are they being effectively used?
 - E. Provide recommendations concerning the direction the department should take if:
 1. resources remain constant;
 2. additional resources become available.
 3. resources are decreased.

This report should be mailed to the Provost, University Mailing Code 1435, Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84322-1435.

APPENDIX B

Schedule of Departmental Reviews

This schedule will be revised each year. Changes in scheduling will occur, for example, in cases where departments are placed on probation and will be required to participate in another review process within a three-year period. Changes will also occur as departments try to match the Regents' review process with the requirements of professional accreditation visits and federal agency reviews.

Each department will receive a review at least once every seven years. In a number of cases, departments will be reviewed once every five years, to coincide with five-year accreditation review requirements.

APPENDIX C

Timetable for Department Reviews

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Identification of departments for review. | - | 2 years prior to due date to Trustees and Commissioner. |
| 2. Orientation meeting with dean And departments. | - | Fall semester preceding Initiation of review. |
| 3. Submission of recommended list of on and off campus evaluators by department and dean. | - | Fall Semester of review year |
| 4. Appointment of off-campus and campus evaluators by Provost's Office. | - | 2 months prior to campus visit. |
| 5. Completion of self study by dept. | - | 1 month prior to campus visit. |
| 6. Visit to campus by department evaluators. | - | Fall and Spring Semesters or by April 1, prior to due date. |
| 7. Evaluator's report submitted to department, dean and Provost. | - | Within 3 weeks of campus visit. |
| 8. Response to report by department and dean's recommendations and prioritization. | - | Within 1 month of receipt of report. |
| 9. Draft report for Board of Trustees to department and dean with Provost. | - | Within 1 month of department and dean report. |
| 10. Submission of report to Board of Trustees. | - | September |
| 11. Submission of report to Board of Regents. | - | As appropriate |

The Provost's Office will provide \$3,000 to each department to fund the Departmental Reviews. This should cover the expenses of bringing two external reviewers to help review the department.