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ORGANIZATION OF THIS DOCUMENT
Following the Introduction and Overview is a Snapshot of the Undergraduate Academic Program Review Process, which provides a timeline and checklists of actions that need to be taken. Details are provided later in this document.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW
Oregon State University (OSU) conducts a variety of reviews including those for newly formed programs, professional licensing and/or accreditation and research programs. Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews, involving a site visit by a review team, are a matter of policy and occur once every 10 years, with ongoing assessment reporting occurring yearly using a full cycle assessment process. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Council (FS CC) and the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) share oversight responsibilities with APAA facilitating the review process.

The Undergraduate Academic Program Review process incorporates a full cycle assessment platform to provide an opportunity for programs to assess the effectiveness of their undergraduate instruction, resources needed to support the program, and development of approaches for continuous improvement. An undergraduate academic program review is an opportunity to reflect, evaluate and plan in a deliberative and collegial setting. Program reviews can assist in identifying strengths, weaknesses, challenges, aspirations, opportunities, and needs including the:

- academic program’s fit with the institutional mission and strategic direction,
- academic program’s focus and its alignment with student success,
- learning environment and the extent to which learning outcomes are achieved,
- extent to which the program is evolving along national trends,
- adequacy of resources,
- areas where OSU can further develop its strengths,
- potential areas for collaboration and interdisciplinary projects/programs.

The process, in brief, consists of:

1. Program self-study and a site visit by a review team consisting of external and OSU faculty;
2. Reviewer’s report following site visit;
3. Development of a departmental/unit action plan (similar to a mini strategic plan);
4. Reassessment of progress within three years of the review with a three-year follow up report.

Undergraduate academic program reviews are evaluative in nature. The review assesses the following three components (Inputs, Outcomes, Impacts) within the context of aligning the mission and goals of the program to those of the academic college(s) and the university.

1. Inputs — the total resources (human and financial) supporting the program, including students, courses, curriculum, financial support, personnel and facilities.
2. Outcomes — both quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning and attainment of programmatic and course learning outcomes, graduation, alumni employment and success, impact of outreach and community engagement; timely completion of degrees; student retention in the program; honors and awards.
3. **Impacts** — quality of the outcomes or impacts that result from the program, including the professional viability of graduates, their satisfaction, national rankings, impact statements and community engagement.

To facilitate program reviews, data on some core metrics common to all units will be provided by Institutional Research (IR) upon request by the unit [the data provided by IR are indicated in Appendix 2 (page 21)]. Other data will need to be collected by the unit. Units should also make use of their annual assessment reports describing assessment of program specific learning outcomes. Annual assessment reports are located on the SharePoint website. This annual assessment report summarizes assessment data, documents successes related to learning outcomes and identifies target areas for improvement. Tracking these reports over time provides important input for judging the trajectory of a program.

**SNAPSHOT OF THE PROCESS**

Undergraduate academic program reviews that include external reviewers are conducted on a decennial schedule ([link to the 10 year calendar](#)). Supplemental interim reviews may be conducted as requested by the unit, by the college dean, Faculty Senate Curriculum Council or may be required by the Provost (or appointee) or Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.

The following is a snapshot of the review process. The terminology used below distinguishes between the specific program under review and the unit in which it is housed. While these may be identical, many programs are operated distinct from their home unit.

**Preparation**

The Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) facilitates the review process by notifying the unit head, college Dean and Associate Dean of academic programs proposed for review in advance of the review schedule. Interdisciplinary baccalaureate programs fall within the purview of this policy; where these guidelines refer to “dean” or “department,” or use other terms that do not fully apply to interdisciplinary programs, appropriate adjustments will be made by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council to assure a meaningful and efficient review.

**Overview**

The APAA representative works with the unit head and/or program lead and the chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council to establish the composition of the review team, the timing of the review, and the content appropriate for the self-study report (using this document as the primary guideline). The unit head, program director, or designee is responsible for preparing the self-study and other materials appropriate for the review. Following preparation of the self-study, the Review team, consisting of external faculty and OSU Faculty Senate Curriculum Council members, conducts a site visit. Based on the site visit and the materials presented in the self-study, the Review team submits a review report to the APAA. The APAA shares the review report with the unit. The unit develops an Action Plan in response to the Reviewer’s Report. The Action Plan is presented (by internal members of the review team) to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. A review is considered complete upon Faculty Senate Curriculum Council’s vote to accept the unit’s Action Plan.
Timeline

**ACTION ITEM:** Bolded and italicized content provide a description of key action items (“to do” list).

**PRE-VISIT TIMELINE**

**Annually Since the Last Academic Program Review (Program Responsibility):**

- Review your comprehensive assessment plan and curriculum map: update as needed.
- Compile and present assessment of student learning data for the prior ten years.
- Assemble and track data/metrics necessary and useful for the review.

**9 Months to 1 Year Before the Review:**

- APAA reminds program of the upcoming academic program review.

**6 Months to 1 Year Before the Review:**

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY:** Identify several possible dates for the review. (APAA website posts a 10 year schedule that identifies the term and year for the review. You need to identify three consecutive days in that term where leadership, such as Deans and unit heads, will be present for days 2 and 3 of the review. Refer to the detailed schedule on page 15.)

  - In highly unusual circumstances, a program may request a postponement. Postponement may not exceed one academic year. APAA and Faculty Senate Curriculum Council must be in concurrence that a postponement is justifiable.

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY:** Program director and/or unit head (or designee) leads preparation of a self-study document based on locally and centrally collected data.

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY:** If you do not have updated/current program data, request data from Institutional Research and assemble internal data, including conducting student exit and alumni surveys. Assemble data not provided by IR. (Table of required data is in Appendix 2).

**4 to 6 Months Before the Site Visit:**

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY:** Submit to APAA representative a list of eight to ten external disciplinary peers (knowledgeable and reputable in the field) and two to three representatives from employing profession (if applicable). Include detailed contact information (full name, title, institution, address, telephone number, email, website). Review team members are appointed by the leadership of APAA from a list provided by the program lead.

- The review team consists of two to three external reviewers and one to two internal reviewers from Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. The review team must be comprised of a minimum of three reviewers. External reviewers cannot have a conflict of interest with OSU. Details about reviewer criteria are on page 13.
3 to 4 Months Before the Site Visit:

- **UNIT/PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY**: Make travel and lodging arrangements for the external reviewers. Expenses for external reviewers (travel, lodging, meals, and honorarium) are the responsibility of the unit/program and/or College whose program is being reviewed. Financial expenses need to be worked out ahead of time within the unit/program and college.

2 to 3 Months Before the Site Visit:

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY**: Submit to APAA representative a draft agenda. The unit needs to reserve rooms and dates in people’s calendars (especially leadership such as Deans, Department Heads/Chairs, School Heads).

4 to 5 Weeks Before the Site Visit:

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY**: Submit to APAA a draft electronic copy of the self-study if the program wants APAA to provide an initial review to ensure all components are present.

2 Weeks Before the Site Visit:

- **PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY**: Submit to APAA an electronic copy of the final version of the self-study. APAA will distribute the electronic self-study to the review team members.

  - If there are large electronic files, break them down into separate appendices, as some email servers reject large files. Please avoid using pictures in the self-study. However, the use of graphs and tables to illustrate an analysis of data are encouraged.

**NOTE**: Failure to provide a self-study in a timely manner and/or lack of cooperation with the review process will lead to suspension of new student enrollment in the program, which may result in termination of the program.

**SITE VISIT: TIMELINE**

1. **DAY 1 – Evening: Review Orientation Dinner** – This dinner is attended by all members of the review team, APAA representative and a representative from the program to be reviewed.

2. **DAY 2 – All Day: Interviews and Report Writing** – Additional details and [sample schedule on page 15-16](#).

3. **DAY 3 – Morning: Report Back** – The primary outcome of this day is the review team provides reports back sessions for the leadership (program lead, APAA representative, unit leadership, College Dean, Provost or Senior Vice Provost). A report back session to the faculty may also be scheduled.

**NOTE**: The program lead and administrative support are available during the site visit to provide
any requested information, attend to last minute needs, and escort review team, etc.

**REVIEWERS’ REPORT: TIMELINE**

2 to 4 Weeks After the Site Visit:

- Reviewers’ Report Due - APAA will forward the report to the program lead for fact checking.

**PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY:** After receiving the Reviewers’ Report, fact check the report. If there are facts that need to be corrected, then please provide correction and submit the corrections back to APAA in a separate document file titled: Response to Reviewers’ Report. Please do not edit Reviewers’ Report or change recommendations or observations made by reviewers. A response to Reviewer’s Report is not required and is not the same as the Action Plan.

**ACTION PLAN: TIMELINE**

**PROGRAM/UNIT RESPONSIBILITY:** Prepare and submit an Action Plan to APAA within 4 months after the site visit.

**FOUR MONTHS AFTER THE SITE VISIT – ACTION PLAN DUE**

- An Action Plan is prepared by the program director, unit head, or designee within four months of the site visit. Details about the action plan are on page 17. Preparation of the Action Plan is expected to be a joint/collaborative effort involving faculty, staff and leadership.
- The unit head and/or Dean should review the Action Plan prior to submission to APAA.
- APAA will forward the Action Plan to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. Additional review and feedback on the Action Plan will be provided at this point. Once the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council votes to accept the Action Plan, then the Action Plan is shared with the Provost (or designee). The Provost (or designee) and Faculty Senate Curriculum Council can specify any additional issues to be addressed and actions to be taken (which will be captured for the record). Once these steps are complete then the academic program review is considered complete.
- Program reviews that occur near the end of the Spring term may request an extension for the Action Plan deadline to accommodate the summer months. This request is made to APAA.
- APAA stores all documents on SharePoint. SharePoint is a permissions-based site. Contact APAA about permissions. ([https://sharepoint.oregonstate.edu/sites/APAA/assessment/default.aspx](https://sharepoint.oregonstate.edu/sites/APAA/assessment/default.aspx))

**3-YEAR FOLLOW-UP REPORT: TIMELINE**

**PROGRAM/UNIT RESPONSIBILITY:** Prepare and submit a 3-Year Follow-Up Report to APAA.

**THREE YEARS AFTER THE SITE VISIT – 3-YEAR FOLLOW-UP REPORT DUE**

- APAA will forward the 3-Year Follow-Up Report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council and the Provost (or designee).
DETAILED GUIDELINES

The program director, unit head, or unit designee is responsible for guiding the preparation of the self-study and assembling data and materials pertinent to the review. The self-study document should be prepared in close collaboration with the faculty, students, staff and leadership of the program unit(s). The person responsible for the self-study will ensure, in writing (via the signed transmittal sheet), that all faculty members have an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study and review the final document.

The self-study should include pertinent data and an interpretation of those data (specific data required for the self-study are in Appendix 1), as well as a description of the impacts of the program. Interpretation should be an assessment of program strengths, weaknesses, challenges, needs and opportunities, thus allowing Review team members to understand what is leading to the academic program’s self-recommendations.

An outline of the contents of the self-study document is presented in Appendix I. Essential data that should be presented in either tables or figures can be provided within the self-study or in appendices. The original data tables provided by Institutional Research must be included in sm appendix in their “raw” form, although these data can be summarized or presented in graphs or tables in the self-study text. Additional data or materials may be included as deemed necessary by the academic program under review. Examples of effective self-study documents are available for review from the APAA.

During decadal academic program reviews, ten years of core metrics based on Fall term data will be available from the Office of Institutional Research (http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/) as part of the self-study document. The last year of decadal data to be included in the self-study document is from the Fall term of the previous year. For example, if a review is scheduled in Winter 2013, the data should be summarized from Fall 2003 – Fall 2012. If a review is in Fall 2013, the data should be summarized from Fall 2003 – Fall 2012. Requests for data from the Office of Institutional Research needs to be in advance (at least two terms) so as to allow time to assemble data. At all times, any core metrics not regularly provided centrally by Institutional Research are the responsibility of the academic program.

APAA is available to review a draft of the self-study document four to five weeks before the site visit.

The academic program must submit to APAA an electronic copy of the final version of the self-study two weeks before the site visit. APAA will distribute, by email, the electronic self-study to all review team members. While APAA will send the self-study to reviewers, the academic program will be responsible for sending the self study to their Dean/Associate Dean and Provost (or Provost designee, Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs). APAA places all documents in SharePoint. (https://sharepoint.oregonstate.edu/sites/APAA/assessment/default.aspx).

If self-study documents for the review are not received by the agreed-upon deadline, if documents lack essential/meaningful content, or if there are no measurable efforts towards the goals and objectives outlined in the action plan, then admissions to the program can be suspended.
Self-Study Report

The primary benefit of an academic program review process lies in the opportunity for self-analysis and the use of this analysis (along with the feedback provided by the Review team) in subsequent program improvement. With the goal to derive maximum benefits from the external review effort, the Self-Study Report is approached as a process of communication and planning rather than as an exercise in generating paper. The Self-Study Report is prepared collectively by the faculty and administration of the academic program unit, and represents an opportunity for colleagues to review departmental, school, or college accomplishments, to share concerns and aspirations, and to develop a long-term vision and strategies for improvement and enhancement. The Self-Study Report documents contents considered during the self-study and describes the conclusions emerging from that process.

Appendix 1 (page 19) provides a suggested outline for the Self-Study Report. The first written section needs to address the question “Why is the degree program offered?” The report should begin by presenting or describing the:

- context of the academic program review, including history of the program,
- mission statement of the academic unit,
- academic unit’s mission relationship to the mission of the school/college and the University
- major short- and long-term goals of the academic unit
- undergraduate degree program, both curricular and co-curricular (high impact practices)
- issues, challenges, and opportunities confronting the unit/program.
- specific questions to the reviewers for which you would appreciate their input or insight.

A significant portion of the self-study is devoted to presentation of metrics (page 10 and Appendix 2), both as inputs of resources and as outputs of program performance. Sections 2 and 3 address these data. Section 2 needs to describe the program and inputs. This includes the methods and extent to which the academic unit collects evidence of student learning. This section needs to answer the questions, “What do you do, with what, and how?” Section 3 describes the program outcomes and addresses the questions, “How well do you do what you do?” “What difference does it make whether you do what you do or not?” “How do you know?”

Section 4 describes the programs impacts, including the viability of the graduates, their satisfaction, national rankings, impact statements, and community engagement.

The last section is the summary and needs to answer the questions, “What have we learned from the program review process?”, “What are the program’s self-recommendations?” and “What vision or goals do you have for the program’s future?”

There may be additional information the program or unit may wish to use to capture unique aspects beyond what is provided in the metrics list. The program needs to contact IR for these data. Questionnaires, as an indirect assessment method, may be used to soliciting impressions of academic program strengths and weaknesses, as well as impacts. Questionnaires should be anonymous, and
designed and administered with care. [Note: The OSU Survey Research Center can help provide assistance regarding the design and application of a survey as well as an analysis of the survey responses.]

Departments/schools may offer multiple baccalaureate majors, minors, and options and may contribute to interdisciplinary majors and minors, the Honors College, general education (Baccalaureate Core), and provide service courses for other majors. APAA, obtaining guidance from Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, will work with the program leader to clearly define the scope of undergraduate instruction to be considered in the review. In general, the academic program review should be designed to be comprehensive, encompassing all aspects of a department's/school's/college's undergraduate educational contributions.

The narrative of the Self-Study Report is, at its core, an analysis of the program’s mission and strategic goals, and how the metrics and other qualitative data reflect the unit’s achievement of those. The Self Study Report needs to be prepared collectively by the faculty and administration of the academic unit housing the program under review. The Self Study Report should review unit accomplishments over the decade, identify weaknesses and challenges, and convey the work of the unit regarding a long-term vision and the role of the degree program in that vision.

There should be an honest assessment of inputs--the adequacy of the infrastructure supporting the program (quality of students; quality of the curriculum; physical facilities; accessibility of courses, technology, and physical facilities; resources; personnel; faculty profile; general infrastructure). Some data sources for general OSU statistics are provided below. These data need to be used as comparative data. If there are questions about comparative data, contact Institutional Research and APAA.

- “Enrollment/Demographic Reports” - [http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/enrollmentdemographic-reports](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/enrollmentdemographic-reports)
- Graduation summaries - [http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/retention-degree-graduation-reports#Graduation%20Sum](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/retention-degree-graduation-reports#Graduation%20Sum)
- “Faculty/Staff Reports” - [http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/faculty-and-staff-reports](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/faculty-and-staff-reports)

Measuring program performance is the heart of the self-study. This involves assessing the quality of the undergraduate program including the breadth and depth of its capacity to fulfill its mission and goals. Items that should be considered and evaluated include student learning outcomes (SLOs), a curriculum map (assessment resources and curriculum map template can be found at [http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment-resources](http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment-resources)), and activities to measure achievement of these outcomes; student and faculty performance metrics; recruitment and retention of students; diversity among both faculty and students, and how the program meets the needs of all stakeholders; student persistence/retention; honors and awards; academic honesty; research and scholarly activity; and metrics for operational effectiveness.

There should be clearly identifiable links between the measurement of program performance and the history of Student Learning Outcome assessment in the program. The program will wish to rely on its annual Assessment Reports to document its understanding of achievement of SLOs and track the progress of continuous improvement. In addition, the self-study should also engage in describing the
quality of the outcomes that result from the existence of the undergraduate program: placement of graduates, student and alumni satisfaction level, employer assessment of program quality, and program improvements resulting from assessment feedback.

Metrics

The metrics, input and outcomes, that need to be included in the report are described here. Please address these input and outcomes data in the relevant sections of the report. Descriptions of data sources can be found in Appendix 2.

General Notes

- If applicable and where possible, separate the data by campus (Corvallis, Cascades, Eastern and Hatfield, etc.) and mode of delivery (Ecampus)
- If applicable account for degree options and certificates.
- Where possible and meaningful, provide the data in a graph or visual format rather than a numeric table.
- Provide raw data from IR in an appendix.
- Provide comparative data for the university and other similar programs.

Students

- Student data should try to account for/differentiate students who begin and end in the major and those who switched.
- Categorize student by admission (applicants; admitted), enrolled (matriculated “enrolled’ in OSU vs currently enrolled – annualized to Fall term - transfer in-out (internal/external)/withdrawn), completion

  Divide student data by:
  - Gender
  - Citizenship
  - Residency
  - Race/ethnicity
  - Pell/loans/financial need
  - Incoming GPA; Cumulative OSU GPA (<2.0; 2.1-2.5; 2.6-3.0; 3.1-3.5; 3.6-4.0)
  - SAT/ACT score(s) (compare to OSU average) (possibly compare to other institutions by program CIP number, but this often costs money)
  - TOEFL
  - Admitted/applied ratio; matriculated/admitted ratio; denied/applied ratio
  - Degree, certificates enrolled in, specialties/concentrations
  - Participation rates in First Year Experience courses
  - Participation rates in co-curricular high impact practices
  - Student honors/awards, scholarly papers/presentations, and/or undergraduate research
  - Degrees and certificates (if applicable) awarded per year, trend over the past 10 years
  - Licensure exam data (if applicable)
  - Degrees awarded by campus – type and head count
  - Graduation #s and %
  - Time to degree
  - Average
  - # students <4 years, 4-6 years, 7+ years
  - Retention rates (1st and 2nd year)
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- # of credit hours by graduation (frequency count by number of hours e.g. 180-190; 190-200; etc.)
- Post-graduation data – This is not a required metric, but highly encouraged.
  - Employment demographics
  - Satisfaction surveys
  - Alumni surveys
  - Employer assessment

Faculty

- FTE Headcount & Instructional Distribution
  - Instructional faculty/student ratio
  - SCH/faculty/year for past 3 years (tenured, tenured track, professional)
  - Course list/faculty/year for past 3 years (tenured, tenured track, professional)
  - Advisor/student ratio
  - Staff
- Faculty Demographics FTE
  - Gender
  - Citizenship
  - Race/ethnicity
  - Type/rank/tenure status
- Professional development (DPD, WIC, diversity, specialized training in student success and teaching)
- Scholarship/Research
  - Peer reviewed publications by year for the past 10 years and number of citations
  - Grants and contracts: Number and amount by year for the past 10 years
  - Patents
  - Other scholarly works
  - Awards

Curriculum and Student Learning

- Curriculum
  - Program learning outcomes
  - Matrix/map (courses mapped to program learning outcomes and description of key assessments mapped to courses)
  - Summary of assessment of student learning data, discoveries, and decisions.
  - Core curriculum requirements per major/minor/electives; program variation options
  - Contributions to the Baccalaureate Core and syllabus for each Bacc core course
  - Course syllabus for each course
  - Course access, enrollment, demographics
    - Frequency taught
    - Last term taught
    - Taught by rank/type (GTA, instructor, assist/assoc/prof)
    - Access to courses (required: on campus, Ecampus, frequency of offering, enrollment versus capacity; electives)
• Enrollment major and non-major
• Indicate if Bacc Core/WIC
• By location
• Course designators (old and current)
• Courses not taught but still in catalog
• courses removed in the past 10 years
• D,F, Withdraw rates
• Average enrollment numbers per term
  • Participation in AAC & U “High impact practices” (1st year seminars & experiences; learning communities; service/community based learning; study abroad; UG research; internship; culminating experience)
    o describe practices and % of the students engage in these practices
• Description of curriculum management process
• Assessment
  o Summaries of annual assessment reports and activities
  o Direct and Indirect assessment methods used
  o Description of full-cycle assessment
  o Trends in eSET scores by course or category of courses (service courses and major courses; or 100 level, 200 level, 300 level, 400 level) (eSET scores separated for Ecampus, if applicable)
• Articulation agreements/curriculum guides (if exist)

Facilities

• Total number of rooms and types of rooms controlled by the unit; utilization of those rooms
• Total capacity (# rooms/ # people per room; capacity: enrollment ratio)
• Computing and technology (currently have; accessibility of technology to students; student use of technology; would like to have)
• Accessibility of physical facilities to disabled

Budget Related

• Operation expenditures (service & supply expenditures; teaching, admin, research salaries)
• Revenue
• Actual and % of how the budget has changes over the past 10 years

General

• Organization chart
• National rankings

The program may want to conduct two surveys prior to the site visit: 1) survey of current students and 2) survey of alumni. To ensure respondent confidentiality, do not include original questionnaires in the self-study or appendices. These data should be tabulated and interpreted in the narrative of the self-study. Additionally, Institutional Research will provide the program with results from its annual exit survey of degree recipients as well as university core metrics.

An electronic copy of the Self-Study Report should be delivered to APAA at least 4 weeks in advance of the scheduled site visit date. The final version of the report is due 2 weeks before the site visit. The program should provide the college dean(s), faculty, students and others, as appropriate, with an electronic copy of the Self-Study Report. Additional copies may be needed if a Graduate Program Review i
Is being conducted concurrent with the Undergraduate Program Review. It is the responsibility of the program director to determine any needs and requirements of other review agencies.

**Failure to provide a Self-Study Report in a timely manner and/or lack of cooperation with the review process will lead to suspension of new student enrollment in the program, which may result in termination of the program.**

**The Review Team**

- The review team consists of 3-5 reviewers (minimum of three). One of the external reviewers should be from out of state and be knowledgeable and reputable in the field and have worked in academia recently. One of the reviewers must be a member of the OSU Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. Additional reviewers are appointed as needed, one may be from an employing profession and can be from in or out of state. Internal appointees must be from outside of the program being reviewed.
  - Assignment of at least one (up to two) Curriculum Council member(s) to the Review team is the responsibility of the chair of the Curriculum Council. On-campus members of the Review team should be from a college other than that of the program under review and may be chosen from a department, school, or college with strong undergraduate instruction connections to the program under review: e.g., from an academic unit that requires course work in the undergraduate academic unit under review.
  - The Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation, having received recommendations from the department chair/school director and the college dean, appoints the other members of the Committee.
  - The external reviewers should be a highly knowledgeable and reputable leader in the field under review. While the Review team members may vary in their familiarity with the subject matter of the program, all should be well versed in undergraduate education. Academic peer reviewers should understand university operations and the role of undergraduate education in a comprehensive research university and have the ability to realistically evaluate the program’s strengths and weaknesses relative to similar programs at comparable institutions, the program’s operations, plans for growth and development and the professional activities of faculty members.
  - An external employer review teamist should also be a highly knowledgeable and reputable leader in his/her field and should have a high degree of familiarity with the current and future needs of degree employees in the field, be very knowledgeable about industry trends and be familiar with graduates of the program and of similar programs.
- External reviewers cannot have a conflict of interest with OSU: former mentors or close personal friends of OSU faculty members; former OSU employees; or individuals who have applied or are likely to apply for a position at OSU. Individuals from institutions substantially different in character from OSU may be less likely to understand local circumstances. Former OSU students are allowable under certain circumstances: if it has been more than 15 years since their graduation; they do not currently have grants/projects/patents affiliated with faculty in the
program being reviewed; or they are the third external reviewer typically representing industry/employers of OSU students.

- Exceptions to reviewer requirements must be approved by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.
- APAA representative accompanies the Review team during the site visit, but is not an official member of the Committee.
- Expenses of the external reviewers, including travel, lodging, meals, honorarium and all other costs associated with the conduct of the review are the responsibility of the unit whose program is being reviewed. In some colleges, these costs are managed centrally in the dean’s office. Travel, lodging, meals and refreshments and meeting room arrangements are made by the program.

**Site Visit**

The site visit is typically one-and-a-half days in length (with activity the evening before and the morning after the day of the site visit), but may be extended if deemed desirable by the Review team or program, or if a joint review is conducted. The schedule and agenda of the site visit will be developed by APAA in consultation with the director of the program being reviewed. Arrangements for scheduling participants and for locating space are the responsibility of the program in consultation with APAA.

- **DAY 1 – Evening: Review Orientation Dinner** – This dinner is attended by the review team, APAA representative and a representative from the program. The APAA representative orients the team to the process including questions for the review, and identifies any additional information they need to conduct the review.
- **DAY 2 – All Day: Interviews and Report Writing** - A day-long schedule of meetings with administrators (including the Dean and any other key administrators), faculty, students and staff involved with the program is conducted. The review team (alone) has a working dinner to identify commendations and recommendations for the report back sessions and to begin (or make significant progress on) a draft of the reviewer report.
- **DAY 3 – Morning: Report Back** – The review team may have some additional report writing time on this day. The primary outcome of this day is the review team provides reports back sessions for the leadership (program lead, department/school leadership, College Dean, Provost or Senior Vice Provost). These can be conducted in a single, longer joint session, or shorter individual sessions (based on Dean’s or unit/program leadership preferences). A report back session to the faculty may also be scheduled.

The visit includes interviews with the college dean(s), the program director, faculty (separate meetings for tenure track and instructional), staff, undergraduate students, graduate teaching assistants, and others as appropriate. The program director does not participate in the separate interviews other than his/her own sessions with the Review team. Confidentiality must be maintained in all discussions. It is helpful to schedule time with students early in the day so that the Review team can further examine any issues or concerns that may be raised by students over the course of the day’s agenda. Additional materials may be requested by the Review team and reviewed at this time if appropriate. Time should also be arranged for any faculty or staff member.
or student who wishes to have a private meeting with the review team. The review team usually observes the research and instructional facilities of the program.

The opportunity should be extended for additional feedback to the review team after the site visit, to allow input from faculty and students who may not be present at the site visit or who may have follow-up comments. These data should be delivered to APAA who will share it with the team no later than one week after the site visit.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the review team (in executive session) reviews its findings and discusses its sense of the review and generates a draft reviewer report. This is a particularly important opportunity to capture the observations of the external reviewer(s).

In addition, the college dean and/or the Provost (or designee) may wish to confer with the external reviewers prior to their departure.

The following is an outline of a typical site visit. The schedule will need to be adjusted based upon people’s availability and the unique needs of the program. It is always recommended that people with power differentiation be in separate meetings and have an opportunity to talk freely. You may also consult with APAA about the schedule.

**Detailed Schedule**

**DAY ONE**

5:45 pm  
Program representative picks up the external reviewers from the hotel and transports them to dinner

6:00 – 8:00 pm  
Dinner with review team: typically two external reviewers, two internal reviewers, representative from APAA and representative from program. (Restaurants that can direct bill the unit, are quiet and/or have a separate eating area, have a diverse menu, and will accommodate dietary requests are suggested.)

**DAY TWO**

8:00 am  
Program representative picks up the external reviewers from the hotel (external reviewers eat breakfast at hotel before being brought to campus)

8:15 – 9:00 am  
Program Director/Coordinator

9:00 – 9:45 am  
Dean of the college

9:45 – 10:15 am  
Unit Head (if different from the program director/coordinator)

10:15 – 10:30 am  
Break

10:30 – 11:15 am  
Tenured faculty

11:15 – 11:45 am  
Junior/untenured faculty or instructional faculty depending on the program (It is
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important to have people with power differentiation in separate meetings)

12:00 – 1:15 pm  Lunch with undergraduate students
1:15 – 1:30 pm  Break
1:30 – 2:00 pm  Instructors
2:00 – 2:45 pm  Curriculum committee
2:45 – 3:30 pm  Facilities tour
3:30 – 4:00 pm  Staff
4:00 – 4:30 pm  Program director (opportunity to ask last minute questions)
5:00 – 6:00 pm  Break
6:00 pm-10 pm  Review team meets for a working dinner, at the hotel, and prepares a written
draft report that identifies strengths, challenges/weaknesses, and
recommendations

**DAY THREE**

8:00 am  Program representative picks up the external reviewers from the hotel (external
reviewers eat breakfast at hotel before being brought to campus)
8:15 – 10:00 am  Review team works on draft report and prepares to present
10:00 – 10:45 am  Review team meets with the Dean, Program Director, and Provost (or designee)
reports back draft strengths, challenges/weaknesses, and recommendations
10:45 – 11:30 am  Review team meets with the faculty for report back

**Reviewer Report**

Based on the site visit and analysis of the materials presented in the self-study document, the review team
prepares a formal report of its findings within two to four weeks of the site visit and finalizes the reviewer
report within four weeks (the outline of the reviewer report is in Appendix 3 and in the separate document
titled “Review Team Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines”). The reviewer report provides both
evaluation and constructive recommendations, and it is important to note that the final document will be a
public record. The report should evaluate the inputs, productivity, and outputs from the program.

The report should contain an overall recommendation to discontinue a program, restructure it, maintain it,
or expand it. Detailed recommendations should be made in support of the overall recommendation and be
designed to improve its quality, increase its effectiveness, or to utilize the university’s resources more
efficiently.
It is the responsibility of the program director to provide a copy of the reviewer report to the college dean(s) and others as appropriate.

**Response to the Reviewers’ Report:** The program director and unit leadership may choose to prepare a response to the reviewers’ report that will be submitted with the self-study and reviewers’ report to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. This response allows the program/unit to share any concerns about the report or site visit or provide corrections as part of the record. **This is not the same as the action plan.** The response to the report must be submitted to APAA within two weeks of receiving the final version of the reviewer report.

**Action Plan**

An Action Plan is to be prepared by the program director within three months of the review (or by another date as agreed upon by all parties and with good reason, such as summer break).

- The action plan needs to address each of the Review team’s recommendations to improve program quality and include specific actions to be taken, by whom, and over what time frame. It needs to include goals, objectives, and reliable and meaningful measures help identify whether the goals and objectives have been met. It also needs to address this work in the context of the College’s and University’s strategic objectives.
- The action plan can have two tiered plans, one based on current resources and one based on conditional resources not under the program’s control (e.g. additional funds allocated by the Dean).

It is recognized the program might not be able to take action, or take only limited action, on a recommendation, particularly if it is dependent upon resources outside of its control (such as resources from the Dean or Provost). In those cases, the program needs to do the following in the action plan:

- State that the recommendation requires resources that are outside of the direct control of the program;
- Develop two contingent actions for that recommendation, one that assumes the resources will be allocated, one that describes actions that will be taken without additional resources.

If a program does not agree with a recommendation, that needs to be addressed in the response to the report, and discussed with APAA who may arrange further conversations with Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, unit leadership, the Dean, and/or the Provost (or designee). This discussion will take into consideration the next steps for the action plan. These decisions will need to be noted in the action plan.

The action plan is then submitted to APAA who forwards it to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.

The action plan needs to be formatted in a way that is easily readable and clearly identifies actions/steps, metrics, timelines, and responsible parties. A format for a table that is included in the action plan is provided below.
**Review Report Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Goal</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- How do these steps meet the recommendation?
- How will you know it is working?

**Consideration of the Self-Study, Review Report, and Action Plan.** The chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council will arrange for the self-study, review report, response to the report, and action plan to be presented at a regular meeting of the Curriculum Council where they are formally considered. The Council may accept the action plan, accept the action plan with revisions, or sent the action plan back for further work. After the Curriculum Council has vote to accept, everything is forwarded by APAA to the Provost.

**Follow-up:** Three years after the site visit APAA contacts the program to submit a status report. The action plan will provide the basis for the follow-up status report. APAA, Curriculum Council, the Dean, and the Provost (or designee) will examine progress achieved through the implementation of the action plan. Outcomes of the follow-up review could range from a conclusion that the action plan implementation is well under way, to a recommendation that insufficient progress has been made and a need exists for further conversation among the program leader, college dean(s), Provost (or designee) regarding the future of the program.

**Failure to complete any of these steps can result in suspension of students admitted to the program.**
APPENDIX 1:

Outline for the Self-Study Document

The following outline indicates the content that is essential to the self-study document. Additional information is appropriate if it will enhance the effectiveness of the presentation of the program quality. Materials that do not relate to the objectives of the program review process should not be included.

The document should not contain information on employees or students that is considered confidential or restricted. The document should contain a table of contents with page numbers to aid the Review team in locating information.

THE SELF-STUDY

PRE-TEXT PAGES

- Cover page - List name of degree program to be reviewed. List all participating departments.
- Table of Contents
- Sign-off sheet include signature of program director and unit head indicating that all faculty members had an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study and/or had an opportunity to review the final document.

I. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

This section should provide a brief history and address the question, “Why do you offer the program?”
Include a description of the process by which the self-study was written and who was involved.
Describe changes since the last Program Review and provide program history.
Mission statement - Explain how the program mission relates to the college(s) and university missions.
Goals - List goals of the program for the next 10 years.
- Describe program strengths
- Current challenges/issues - List issues that are confronting the program
- Review goals - Identify critical questions the program faculty hopes to have answered as a result of the program review.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND INPUTS

This section should answer the question, “What do you do, with what and how?”
Include descriptions of committees, including how the program reviews and discusses the curriculum.
Provide the student learning outcomes and curriculum details.
Refer to the Metrics list (page 10 or Appendix 2). Present and discuss trends in the data presented in Tables at the end of the document.
III. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

This section should answer the questions, “How well do you do what you do?”; “What difference does it make whether you do what you do or not?”; “How do you know?” Refer to the Metrics list. Present and discuss trends in the data. IV.

IMPACTS

This section should answer the questions, “What impacts has our program had on the field and/or the state or local communities?” Discuss and provide evidence and statements of the impact of the program. including the professional viability of graduates, their satisfaction, national rankings, impact statements and community engagement. List community partners and discuss the nature of community engagement.

V. SUMMARY

This section should answer the questions, “What have we learned from the program review process?”, “What are the program’s self-recommendations?”, and “What vision or goals do you have for the program’s future?”

Self-recommendations – List recommendations for enhancing program quality based on analysis and interpretation of the self-study document, or for dissolution of the program

If desired, you may present information in the self-study in the form of questions for the review team to consider.

V. REQUIRED APPENDICES

Raw data from IR
CVs
Syllabi (up to date) for all courses with learning outcomes
Curriculum outline, learning outcomes, frequency of courses taught, who teaches
Curriculum map
Table: List of faculty, grants and number of publications in the past 10 years, number of undergraduate students currently supervising in a lab or for thesis/major project, courses taught in the past 2 years with number of credits and number of students in each course
APPENDIX 2:  
Metrics Source List

Note: unless otherwise noted, all national or peer comparisons will be the responsibility of the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Sub-ITEM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student awards/honors/presentations/research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Pell/loans/financial aid</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Incoming GPA</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>OSU cumulative GPA</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>SAT scores</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>ACT scores</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Degree type sought</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Concentrations</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Pell/loans/financial aid</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Incoming GPA</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>OSU cumulative GPA</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>SAT scores</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>ACT scores</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Degree type sought</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>Concentrations</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Pell/loans/financial aid</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Incoming GPA</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>OSU cumulative GPA</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>SAT scores</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>ACT scores</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Degree type sought</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Concentrations</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Participation rates in first year experience courses</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>Students who shifted into</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>Sub-ITEM</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Admit rate (admit to apply)</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Yield rate (matric to admit)</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Denied to applied ratio</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees and certificates earned</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees and certificates earned</td>
<td>By campus (Ecampus, Cascades, Honors)</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure pass rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-to-degree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-to-degree</td>
<td>Year groupings (&lt;4 yrs, 4-6 years, 7+ years)</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of credit hours by graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing from listing: total enrollment (term, annual, etc) as opposed to matriculation (which is tied to application pool); distinction of admit type (freshman, transfer, post baccalaureate).

Faculty (where feasible, report headcount and FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Sub-ITEM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional faculty/student ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH/faculty/year</td>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor/student ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer reviewed publication citations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>Award amount</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other scholarly works</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum and Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Sub-ITEM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate eSET scores for program</td>
<td></td>
<td>APAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department/APAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course to program SLO map</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of assessment of SLO, discoveries, decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Frequency taught</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Last term taught</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Taught by rank/type</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>By Major and non-major</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Indicate BaccCore/WIC</td>
<td>IR/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course designators</th>
<th>IR/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Courses not taught but in catalog</td>
<td>IR/APAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Courses removed in past 10 years</td>
<td>APAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course access</td>
<td>Frequency of offerings</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course access</td>
<td>Campus offered</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course access</td>
<td>Enrollment versus capacity</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course access</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>1st year seminars &amp; experiences</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>Learning communities</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>Service/community based learning</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>UG research</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U “high impact” practices</td>
<td>Culminating experiences</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of annual assessment report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of curriculum management process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation agreements/curriculum guides</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department/APAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Sub-ITEM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rooms controlled by department</td>
<td>Number by type</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms controlled by department</td>
<td>Space utilization rate</td>
<td>Campus Planners/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capacity</td>
<td>Square footage</td>
<td>Campus Planner/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># people per room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment per room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and technology</td>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and technology</td>
<td>Availability to students</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and technology</td>
<td>Student use</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Sub-ITEM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual and % change of budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Sub-ITEM</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational chart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National rankings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3:
Review Report Outline

1. Overall Recommendation:
   - Expand
   - Maintain
   - Restructure
   - Reduce
   - Suspend
   - Discontinue
   - Other

2. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

   This section serves as an executive summary of the review report. A narrative style is common, but a bulleted list of key issues and findings may be useful. It summarizes all the major recommendations found in the body of the main report. This section generally does not exceed one to two pages in length.

3. Detailed Findings

   This is the main body of the report. As such, it identifies the strengths and weaknesses/challenges of the program and provides a rationale for each point. It provides the details of the review findings and the basis for each recommendation. The report may be organized such that specific recommendations are interspersed throughout the narrative of the report, but the recommendations should be highlighted in some manner so they may be easily identified. The subsections of the report may vary depending upon the unit and nature of the program being reviewed. The length of the entire report is generally six to ten pages. A typical report includes the following sections:

   Introduction: Objectives of the review, participants, order of events and organization of the report

Inputs:

- The mission of the program, and its relationship and alignment with the mission of the academic college(s), and that of the University.
- Recruitment and enrollment trends of students
- Admissions selectivity and other indications of selecting high quality students
- Curriculum and assessment strength
- Quality of personnel and adequacy to achieve mission and goals
- Level and quality of infrastructure
- Quality of organizational support
Productivity:

- 4- and 6-year graduation rates for students
- Publications or evidence of other scholarly work by students and faculty
- Student satisfaction with their education and mentoring experiences
- Viability of scholarly community within which students can interact

Outcomes and Impacts:

- Student learning and outcomes and assessment of learning
- Placement and success of graduates
- Satisfaction of students and graduates with their education and their post-graduation employment success
- Professional or national rankings/ratings
- Community engagement activities

Conclusion and Recommendations for Improvement
APPENDIX 4:

Signature Sheet

In signing this document, I (as Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair) indicate that all faculty members in the academic program under review have had an opportunity to participate in the development of this self-study and review the final document.

____________________________________  __________________
Name                                      Date