

Materials linked from the October 29, Curriculum Council agenda.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Overview	2
The Self Study	2
Review Criteria	2
Snapshot of Undergraduate Program Review Process	3
Preparation	3
Timeline.....	4
Pre-Visit Timeline	4
Site Visit Timeline.....	5
Review Report Timeline.....	6
Action Plan Timeline	7
Three Year Follow-up Meeting	7
Information for Programs	8
Self-Study Report	8
Metrics	10
Review Panel	13
Site Visit.....	14
Review Report.....	16
Response to the Review Report.....	16
Consideration of the Review Report.....	16
Action Plan	17
Consideration of the Action Plan	18
Follow-Up.....	18
Appendix 1: Outline for the Self-Study Document	19
Appendix 2: Metrics Sources	21

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Oregon State University conducts a variety of reviews including those for newly formed programs, professional licensing and/or accreditation and research programs. Regular reviews of undergraduate level academic programs are also a matter of policy and occur once every 10 years. The Curriculum Council and the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) share oversight responsibilities.

These reviews provide an opportunity for programs to evaluate the effectiveness of their undergraduate instruction, the resources needed to support it, and how to develop approaches for continuous improvement. An undergraduate program review is an opportunity to reflect, evaluate and plan in a deliberative and collegial setting. Program reviews can assist in identifying strengths, weaknesses, aspirations, opportunities, and needs including:

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

The process in brief consists of:

1. A self-study, site visit, and review committee report
2. Departmental response to the review committee report and development of an action plan
3. A meeting with the Dean, Head, and Provost (or designee)
4. A reassessment of progress within three years of the review

THE SELF-STUDY

Review Criteria

Undergraduate program reviews are evaluative in nature. The review assesses the following three components 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 capital) supporting the program. reporting and evaluation of program inputs or resources, including students, courses, curriculum, financial support, personnel and facilities.
2. Outcomes—both quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning and attainment of programmatic learning outcomes, graduation, alumni employment and success, impact of

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

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.

Details of the self-study document can be found on [page *](#).

To facilitate program reviews, data on some core metrics common to all units will be provided by Institutional Research (IR) annually by the end of each fall term (the data provided by IR are indicated by (*IR) in the Metrics section of this report ([page *](#)). Other data will need to be collected by the unit. Units should also make use of assessment of program specific learning outcomes they collect and maintain on an annual basis and which is submitted to APAA ([link to SharePoint](#)). This annual report summarizes assessment data and document 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 Undergraduate Program Review Process

Undergraduate 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, or as deemed appropriate by Provost (or appointee).

The following is a snapshot of the review process. The terminology used below distinguished 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 initiates a schedule of reviews, notifying the chair/school director and college dean of programs proposed for review well 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 Curriculum Council to assure a meaningful and efficient review.

The Academic Programs representative works with the department chair/school director and college dean and the chair of the Curriculum Council to establish the composition of the Review Committee, the timing of the review, and the content appropriate for the self-study report. The department chair/school or program director is responsible for preparing the self-study and other materials appropriate for the review. Following review of the self-study, the Review Committee conducts a site visit. Based on the site visit and the materials presented in the self-study, the Review Committee submits an Evaluation Report to the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation.

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Timeline

PRE-VISIT TIMELINE

1 Year Prior to the Review

- Program is reminded of the upcoming academic review.

6 Months – 1+ Years Before the Site Visit

- Identify specific dates for the review (we currently have a 10 year schedule [\(link\)](#) that has been reviewed by Deans and School/Department Heads)
- In highly unusual circumstances, a program may request a postponement. Postponement may not exceed one academic year. The Director of APAA and the Curriculum Council must be in concurrence that a postponement is justifiable.
- Program director leads preparation of a self-study document based on locally and centrally collected data.
- Request data from Institutional Research and assemble internal data, including conducting student exit and alumni surveys.

3-6 Months Before the Site Visit

□ PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: At least 6 months prior to site visit - Request any additional data from Institutional Research.

□ PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: 4-5 months prior to site visit - Submit to Academic Programs Assessment and Accreditation (APAA) a list of 6 external disciplinary peers (knowledgeable and reputable in the field) and 2-3 representatives from employing profession (if applicable).

- Review Panel members are appointed by the Director of APAA from a list provided by the program lead. The following information needs to be provided: Full name, title, institution, address, phone, email, website.
- The panel consists of 3-5 reviewers (minimum of three). Two of the reviewers must be from out of state and be knowledgeable and reputable in the field and have worked in academia recently the third reviewer is a member of the OSU Curriculum Council. Additional members are appointed as needed, one may be from an employing profession and can be from in or out of state. A second internal faculty member may also be appointed. Internal appointees must be from outside of the program being reviewed.
- These reviewers cannot have a conflict of interest with OSU. The Review Panel cannot include former mentors or close personal friends of OSU faculty members, former OSU students, former OSU employees, individuals who have applied or are likely to apply for a position at OSU, or individuals from institutions substantially different in character from OSU who would be less likely to understand local circumstances.

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

□ PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: 4-5 months prior to site visit - Select specific dates (3 consecutive days). Submit to APAA a draft agenda. The Director will distribute the agenda to the review panel for their input. The unit needs to reserve rooms and dates in people's calendars (especially leadership such as Deans, Department Heads/Chairs, School Heads).

□ UNIT RESPONSIBILITY: 3-4 months prior to site visit –Make travel arrangements for the external reviewers. Expenses for external reviewers (travel, lodging, meals, and any honorarium) are the responsibility of the unit and/or College Dean whose program is being reviewed. Financial expenses need to be worked out ahead of time within the unit and college.

4-5 Weeks Before the Site Visit

□ PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: At least 4 weeks prior to site visit - submit a draft electronic copy of the self-study to Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) for an initial review to ensure all components are present.

2 Weeks Before the Site Visit

□ PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: 2 weeks before site visit -- submit electronic copy of the self-study to Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) . If there are non-electronic appendices, submit as many copies as there are reviewers plus one for APAA records. APAA will distribute the self-study to the Review Panel members.

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

- DAY 1 – Evening: Review Orientation Dinner – This dinner is attended by the review panel and the APAA representative. The APAA representative orients the team to the process and the team begins discussions about the self-study, 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, faculty, students and staff involved with the program is conducted. The review

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

panel (alone) has a working dinner to identify main points for the report back sessions and to complete a draft of the report.

- DAY 3 – Morning: Report Back – The review panel may have some additional report writing time on this day. The primary outcome of this day is the review panel 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.

NOTE: The program lead and administrative support need to be available to provide any additional requested information, attend to last minute needs, etc.

REVIEW REPORT TIMELINE

- TWO WEEKS AFTER SITE VISIT – Draft Review Report Due - A first draft report should be completed by Day 3 of the site visit. The Review Panel submits a near final draft of the written report to APAA within two weeks of the site visit. APAA will forward the draft report to the program lead for fact checking.

□ PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: After receiving the draft report, fact check the report and begin writing a response to the report (as it is unlikely the report will change substantially). A response to the report is not required and is not the same as the Action Plan. This response allows the program/unit to share any concerns or opinions about the report and/or site visit and note them as part of the record. The response will be submitted to the Curriculum Council along with the final reviewer report.

- FOUR WEEKS AFTER SITE VISIT – Fact Checks Due - The program lead and associated units review the report for factual errors. Only factual information that can be supported by documentation will be changed in the reviewer report. Requests for changes to the report need to be noted and sent to APAA, who will then send all of the compiled changes to the reviewers.
- FIVE WEEKS AFTER SITE VISIT – Final Review Report Due – The final version of the report is submitted to APAA, cc’ing the program lead.
- SIX WEEKS AFTER SITE VISIT – Response to the Review Report Due – If the program or unit wishes, a response to the report may be submitted to APAA. This response allows the program/unit to share any concerns or opinions about the report and/or site visit and note them as part of the record. The response will be submitted to the Curriculum Council along with the final reviewer report.
- SEVEN WEEKS AFTER SITE VISIT – Review Report and Response to Report Submitted to the Curriculum Council –APAA submits the review report and the program’s response to the report to the Curriculum Council for final acceptance.

ACTION PLAN TIMELINE

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

□ **UNIT RESPONSIBILITY:** Submit an action plan to APAA within 3 months after the review report (and, if submitted, response to the report) is accepted by the Curriculum Council

- **THREE MONTHS AFTER THE REVIEW REPORT IS ACCEPTED BY THE CURRICULUM COUNCIL – Action Plan Due** - 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). The action plan needs to address each of the Review Panel’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 is then submitted to APAA, who will forward it to the Provost (or designee), Chair of the Curriculum Council, and the Dean. Feedback on the action plan will be provided at this point (NOTE: Depending on the structure and leadership approach of the College, the Dean may have already worked closely with the unit or program on the initial draft of the plan). A meeting will not be set with the Provost (or designee) until the Action Plan is an “approvable” form. Details about the action plan format are on page *.
- **Consideration of the Action Plan** After initial review the action plan will be presented by the program director/unit head at a meeting with the chair of the Curriculum Council, academic college dean(s), APAA representative, and the Provost (or designee). At the conclusion of the meeting, if the Provost (or designee) finds the plan acceptable, then he/she will sign off on the action plan, specifying any additional issues to be addressed and actions to be taken. At an agreed upon date, typically three years later, the Curriculum Council will conduct a follow-up review to determine if the planned actions have been implemented (see “Follow-up” section below).
- APAA submits the final version of the Action Plan to the Curriculum Council.
- The outcome of the review process is communicated by the APAA leadership to the members of the Review Panel.

3-YEAR FOLLOW-UP MEETING TIMELINE

- APAA schedules a follow-up meeting to include Provost (or designee), APAA leadership, Curriculum Council chair, Review Committee chair, college dean, department/school chair/head. The meeting reviews the progress that has been made on the Action Plan.

**Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Programs**

The program director (or department chair/school director if appropriate) 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 program director is responsible for ensuring in writing that all faculty members have an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study and have an opportunity to review the final document.

The self-study should include pertinent data and an interpretation of those data. The interpretation should be an assessment of program strengths, weaknesses, needs and opportunities. The interpretation of the data should allow Review Panel members to understand what is leading to the program's self-recommendations. The Dean and/or Associate Dean of the appropriate college will receive and review the self-study document not less than two weeks in advance of the site visit.

If documents for the review are not received by the agreed 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 the admissions to the program will be suspended.

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 are also provided as appendices. Additional data or materials may be included as deemed necessary by the program under review. Examples of effective self-study documents are available for review from the APAA.

Years and Transition:

Centrally provided core metrics will be provided to all programs annually beginning **TBD***. During decadal program reviews, ten years of core metrics based on fall term data will be provisioned 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 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 must be made checking length of time IR needs to assemble data. At all times, any core metrics not regularly provided centrally are the responsibility of the programs.

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 Committee) in subsequent program improvement. In order to derive maximum benefits from the external review effort, it is crucial

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

that the self-study be approached as a process of communication and planning rather than as an exercise in generating paper. The self-study should be prepared collectively by the faculty and administration of the academic program unit, and should be 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 simply documents the matters considered during the self-study and describes the conclusions emerging from that process.

Appendix 1 provides a suggested outline for the Self-Study Report. The report should begin by presenting the review context and go on to describe the mission statement of the academic unit, and its relationship to the mission of the school/college and the University. The major short- and long-term goals of the academic unit and the undergraduate degree program should be presented. Issues, challenges, and opportunities confronting the unit/program also need to be described. The first written section needs to address the question “Why do you offer the program?”

A significant portion of the self-study is devoted to presentation of metrics, 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?” Page * presents the input metrics. 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?”

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

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 are often useful in soliciting impressions of academic program strengths and weaknesses. If used, 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. The leadership of Academic Programs, obtaining guidance from the 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 is, at its core, an analysis of the program’s mission and strategic goals, and of how the metrics and other qualitative data reflect the unit’s achievement of those. It needs to be

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

prepared collectively by the faculty and administration of the academic unit housing the program under review. It 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:

- “Enrollment/Demographic Reports” - <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/ir/enrollmentdemographic-reports>
- Graduation summaries - <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>

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, 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 that need to be included in the report are described here. The metrics have been divided into two categories, input and outcomes. Please address these input and outcomes data in the relevant sections of the report (described on [pages *](#)). Descriptions of data sources can be found in Appendix 2.

General Notes

- If applicable and where possible, separate the data by program by campus (Corvallis, Cascades, 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.

Students

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

- Student data should try to account for students who do not start off in the major they end up with.
- Categorize student by:

INPUT: **admission** (applicants; admitted), **enrolled** (matriculated “enrolled” in OSU vs currently enrolled – annualized to Fall term - transfer in-out (internal/external)/withdrawn)

OUTCOME: **completion**

Divide student data by

- Gender
- Citizenship
- Residency
- Race/ethnicity
- Pell/loans/financial – more specificity needed to define the parameters
- 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
- OUTCOME: Degrees and certificates (if applicable) awarded per year, trend over the past 10 years
 - Licensure exam data (if applicable)
 - Degrees awarded by campus (Ecampus, on-campus, honors) – type and head count
 - Graduation #s and %
- OUTCOME: Time to degree
 - Average
 - # students <4 years, 4-6 years, 7+ years
- INPUT: Retention rates (1st and 2nd year)
- OUTCOME: # of credit hours by graduation (frequency count by number of hours e.g. 180-190; 190-200; etc.)
- OUTCOME: Post-graduation data – This is not a required metric, but highly encouraged.
 - Employment
 - Satisfaction
 - Alumni
 - Employer assessment

Faculty

- INPUT: Headcount & by FTE
 - Instructional faculty/student ratio
 - SCH/faculty/year
 - Advisor/student ratio
 - Gender
 - Citizenship

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

- Race/ethnicity
- Type/rank/tenure status
- OUTCOME: Peer reviewed publications by year for the past 10 years
 - Number of citations
- OUTCOME: Grants. Contracts, Awards, other
 - Number by year for the past 10 years
 - Amount by year for the past 10 years
 - Patents
 - Other scholarly works
 - Awards
- INPUT: Professional development activities and participation (DPD, safe space training, specialized training, etc.) (Who? How many? Is it the same people attending these events?)

Curriculum and Student Learning

- INPUT: Aggregate eSET scores by program
- Curriculum
 - INPUT: Program student learning outcomes
 - INPUT: Core curriculum requirements per major/minor/electives; program variation options
 - INPUT: Matrix/map (courses mapped to program learning outcomes and description of key assessments mapped to courses)
 - OUTCOME: Summary of assessment of student learning data/ annual assessment reports discoveries, and decisions.
 - INPUT: Course list
 - 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
- INPUT: AAC & U “High impact practices” (1st year seminars & experiences; learning communities; service/community based learning; study abroad; UG research; internship; culminating experience)
- INPUT: Description of curriculum management process
- INPUT: Articulation agreements/curriculum guides (if exist)
- OUTCOME: Results of articulation agreements (number of students transferring in each year)

Facilities

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

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

- INPUT; accessibility of physical facilities to disabled
- OUTCOMES: Changes to facilities

Budget Related

- INPUT: Operation expenditures (service & supply expenditures; teaching, admin, research salaries)
- INPUT: Revenue
- OUTCOME: 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 should be delivered to APAA 4-5 weeks in advance of the scheduled site visit date for feedback. The final version of the report is due 2 weeks before the site visit. If there are non-electronic materials, at least one copy for each review panel member and an additional copy for records should be delivered to APAA. The program also should provide the college dean(s), faculty, students and others, as appropriate, with a copy of the self-study or access to a copy. Additional copies may be needed if a Graduate Program Review or other review is being conducted concurrently 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 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 PANEL

At the minimum, the Undergraduate Academic Program Review Panel is to be comprised of one member of the Curriculum Council one optional additional member of the Faculty (who may or may not be a member of the Curriculum Council), and a minimum of two, and preferably three, disciplinary peers external to OSU. At least two of the external evaluators must be external to Oregon. Additional participants may be desirable, especially external members where professional programs are involved. The inclusion of a representative of the employing profession may be particularly helpful. The leadership of Academic Programs accompanies the Review Committee during the site visit, but is not an official member of the Committee.

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Assignment of one Curriculum Council member to the Review Committee is the responsibility of the chair of the Curriculum Council. 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. On-campus members of the Review Committee 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 external reviewers should be a highly knowledgeable and reputable leader in the field under review. While the Review Committee members may vary in their familiarity with the subject matter of the program, all should be well versed in undergraduate education.

Avoid conflict of interest when nominating reviewers. The Review Panel will not include former mentors or close personal friends of OSU faculty members, former OSU students, former OSU employees, individuals who have applied or are likely to apply for a position at OSU, or individuals from institutions substantially different in character from OSU who would be less likely to understand local circumstances. APAA may consult with the academic dean regarding the selection of reviewers from among those nominated. The credibility of the review will be enhanced by identifying thoughtful, experienced, knowledgeable and objective external reviewers.

The external disciplinary peer reviewers should be a highly knowledgeable academicians and recognized leaders in the field under review. 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 panelist 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.

Expenses of the external reviewers, including travel, lodging, meals, any 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

Following review of the self-study report, the Review Panel will conduct a site visit of the program. 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 Panel 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.

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

The visit includes interviews with the college dean(s), the program director, faculty, staff, graduate students and others as appropriate. The program director does not participate in the separate interviews other than his/her own session with the Review Panel. Confidentiality must be maintained in all discussions. It is helpful to schedule time with students early in the day so that the Panel 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 Panel 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 Panel. The Panel usually observes the research and instructional facilities of the program.

The opportunity should be extended for additional feedback to the Panel 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 the Panel Chair no later than one week after the site visit.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the Panel (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.

DAY ONE

7:00 – 9:00 pm Dinner with review team

DAY TWO

8:00 – 9:00 am Program Director

9:00 – 9:45 am Program staff (graduate coordinator and staff, as appropriate)

9:45 – 10:15 am Students

10:15 – 10:30 am Break

10:30 – 12:15 pm Program faculty

12:15 – 1:15 pm Working lunch for Review Panel

1:15 – 2:00 pm Facilities tour

2:00 – 2:45 pm College Dean(s)

2:45 – 3:00 pm Break

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

3:00 – 3:45 pm	Program committee(s) (e.g., admission committee, curriculum committee)
3:45 – 4:30 pm	Program director
4:30 – 8:00 pm	Review team meets for a working dinner, identifies recommendations, and drafts report

DAY THREE

7:30 – 9:30 am	Review team breakfast and report writing
9:30 – 11:00 am	Review team meets with the Dean, Program Director, and SVPAA for report back
11:00 – 12:00 pm	Optional - review team meets with the faculty for report back

REVIEW REPORT

Based on the site visit and analysis of the materials presented in the self-study document, the Review Panel prepares a formal report of its findings within two weeks of the site visit and finalizes the report within four weeks (see outline, page *). The 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.

The initial draft is submitted by the Panel Chair to APAA within 2 weeks following the review. APAA will submit the draft report to the program director for review of errors in factual content. Corrections of fact suggested by the program director are reconciled with the review panel and APAA. After factual information has been confirmed the final report is submitted by the review panel simultaneously to the APAA and to the program director. It is the responsibility of the director to provide a copy of the report to the college dean(s) and others as appropriate.

Response to the Review Report The program director and unit leadership may choose to prepare a response to the reviewer report that will be submitted with the self-study and reviewer report to the Curriculum Council. This response allows the program/unit to share any concerns about the report or site visit 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.

Consideration of the Review Report The chair of the Curriculum Council will arrange for the self-study, review report, and response to the report to be presented at a regular meeting of the Curriculum

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Council where they are formally considered. The program director and academic college dean(s) will be invited to the Curriculum Council meeting to comment on the report and plan. The Council may accept the report as distributed, accept the report with revisions, or send the report back to the Review Panel for further work. After the Curriculum Council has accepted the report, it is forwarded by APAA to the Provost (or designee).

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). The action plan needs to address the 10 year goals (as identified in the self-study) each of the Review Panel’s recommendations to improve program quality. It needs to include goals, objectives, and reliable and meaningful measures help identify whether the goals and objectives have been met. It needs to include specific actions to be taken, by whom, and over what time frame, as well as, address this work in the context of the College’s and University’s strategic objectives ([link to OSU Strategic Plan *](#)).

The action plan is then submitted to APAA, who will forward it to the Provost (or designee), Chair of the Curriculum Council, and the Dean. Feedback on the action plan will be provided at this point (NOTE: Depending on the structure and leadership approach of the College, the Dean may have already worked closely with the unit or program on the initial draft of the plan). A meeting will not be set with the Provost (or designee) until the Action Plan is an “approvable” form.

A possible format for the action plan is:

Program Goal:

Action	Metric	Outcome	Who	When

- How do these steps meet the goal?
- How will you know it is working/achieving the goal?

Review Report Recommendation:

Action	Metric	Outcome	Who	When

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

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Consideration of the Action Plan After initial review the action plan will be presented by the program director/unit head at a meeting with the chair of the Curriculum Council, academic college dean(s), APAA representative, and the Provost (or designee).

At the conclusion of the meeting, if the Provost (or designee) finds the plan acceptable, then he/she will sign off on the action plan, specifying any additional issues to be addressed and actions to be taken. At an agreed upon date, typically three years later, the Curriculum Council will conduct a follow-up review to determine if the planned actions have been implemented (see “Follow-up” section below).

Follow-up Three years after the review the Curriculum Council examines progress achieved through the implementation of the action plan. Reports of these follow-up reviews are shared with APAA, who forwards copies to the program director/unit leader, academic dean(s) and Provost (or designee). Follow-up reports are reviewed by the Curriculum Council. Outcomes of the follow-up review could range from a conclusion that the action plan was appropriate and its 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.

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 be tabbed into appropriate sections to aid the Review Panel 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 (or department chair if appropriate) 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 question should 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
- 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
- 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?”
- Refer to the Metrics list (page * of this document or website address*). 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 (page * of this document or website address*). Present and discuss trends in the data.

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

IV. SUMMARY

- This section should answer the questions, “What have we learned from the program review process?” and “What are the program’s self-recommendations?”
- Self-recommendations – List recommendations for enhancing program quality based on analysis and interpretation of the self-study document, or for dissolution of the program

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Appendix 2
Metrics Source List

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

Students

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Student awards/honors/presentations/research		Department
Applicants	Gender	IR
Applicants	Citizenship	IR
Applicants	Residency	IR
Applicants	Ethnicity	IR
Applicants	Pell/loans/financial aid	IR
Applicants	Incoming GPA	IR
Applicants	OSU cumulative GPA	IR
Applicants	SAT scores	IR
Applicants	ACT scores	IR
Applicants	TOEFL	IR
Applicants	Degree type sought	IR
Applicants	Concentrations	IR
Admits	Gender	IR
Admits	Citizenship	IR
Admits	Residency	IR
Admits	Ethnicity	IR
Admits	Pell/loans/financial	IR
Admits	Incoming GPA	IR
Admits	OSU cumulative GPA	IR
Admits	SAT scores	IR
Admits	ACT scores	IR
Admits	TOEFL	IR
Admits	Degree type sought	IR
Admits	Concentrations	IR
Matriculated	Gender	IR
Matriculated	Citizenship	IR
Matriculated	Residency	IR
Matriculated	Ethnicity	IR
Matriculated	Pell/loans/financial	IR
Matriculated	Incoming GPA	IR
Matriculated	OSU cumulative GPA	IR
Matriculated	SAT scores	IR
Matriculated	ACT scores	IR
Matriculated	TOEFL	IR
Matriculated	Degree type sought	IR
Matriculated	Concentrations	IR
Matriculated	Participation rates in first year experience courses	IR
Applicants	Admit rate (admit to apply)	IR
Applicants	Yield rate (matric to admit)	IR

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Applicants	Denied to applied ratio	IR
Degrees and certificates earned	Annual	IR
Degrees and certificates earned	By campus (Ecampus, Cascades, Honors)	IR
Licensure pass rates		Department
Time-to-degree	Mean	IR
Time-to-degree	Year groupings (<4 yrs, 4-6 years, 7+ years)	IR
Retention Rate	1 year	IR
Retention Rate	2 year	IR
# of credit hours by graduation		IR

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)

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

Curriculum and Student Learning

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Aggregate eSET scores for program		APAA
Program student learning outcomes		Department/APAA
Course to program SLO map		Department
Summary of assessment of SLO, discoveries, decisions		Department
Courses	Frequency taught	IR
Courses	Last term taught	IR
Courses	Taught by rank/type	IR
Courses	By Major and non-major	IR
Courses	Indicate BaccCore/WIC	IR/Department
Courses	Campus	IR
Courses	Course designators	IR/Department
Courses	Courses not taught but in catalog	IR/APAA
Courses	Courses removed in past 10 years	APAA
Course access	Frequency of offerings	IR

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

Course access	Campus offered	IR
Course access	Enrollment versus capacity	IR
Course access	Electives	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	1 st year seminars & experiences	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Learning communities	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Service/community based learning	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Study abroad	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	UG research	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Internship	Department
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Culminating experiences	Department
Summary of annual assessment report		Department
Description of curriculum management process		Department
Articulation agreements/curriculum guides		Department/APAA

Facilities

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

Budget

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Operational expenditures		Department
Revenue		Department
Actual and % change of budget		Department

General

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Organizational chart		Department
National rankings		Department

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines
DRAFT – v. 10-22-2014

SAMPLE SIGN-OFF SHEET

In signing this document, I indicate that all faculty members in the program have had an opportunity to participate in the development of this self-study and review the final document.

John Q. Bean, Graduate Program Director

Date

Associate Professor

Peter Okra, Unit Leader

Date

Professor