

**DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014**

Materials linked from the October 29, Curriculum Council agenda.

General Overview The Curriculum Council and Office of Academic Programs, Assessment & Accreditation (APAA) have joint responsibility for overseeing the quality of undergraduate graduate programs at Oregon State University. Following a standard format, reviews of undergraduate programs are conducted by the APAA in coordination with the Curriculum Council. Undergraduate Program Reviews involve the preparation of a full self-study, a one-and-a-half day site visit by a panel of reviewers and the approval of a formal review report by the Curriculum Council.

Self-Study Document The primary benefit of the program review process lies in the opportunity for self-analysis and the use of this analysis along with the report of the Review Panel in subsequent program enhancement. Thus, a major component of the program review process is the preparation of a self-study document, which serves as the primary source of information for the Review Panel. The self-study document is prepared by the program director in close collaboration with the faculty, students, staff and leadership of the program unit.

The Review Panel The Review Panel is appointed by APAA. APAA works with the program director to identify internal and external panelists, and with the chair of the Curriculum Council to assign Curriculum Council panelists. The Review Panel is composed of one member of the Curriculum Council, one possible additional member of the OSU Faculty depending on need/circumstance (e.g. Cascades campus representation), and at least two external academic disciplinary peers. Programs have the option of including one employer of degree recipients as an additional review panelist. Internal members of the Panel should be from colleges other than that of the program under review. Additional internal and external panelists may be assigned as deemed necessary. An APAA representative accompanies the Review Panel during the site visit to observe and facilitates and participates in the review.

Internal reviewers are part of the process to provide a Faculty Senate presence/accountability, presence of a review team member when the self-study, reviewer report and response to the review report, are presented to the Curriculum Council for acceptance, and to provide internal organizational information and perspectives to the external reviewers.

Every attempt is made to avoid conflict of interest in selection of external reviewers.

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.

Pre-review Dinner The APAA representative will meet with the Review Panel over a working dinner the evening prior to the site visit. The self-study document will be reviewed, and the Academic Affairs

**DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014**

leaders will advise the Panel on review procedures. Significant issues to be examined during the site visit will be identified. During this meeting, the agenda of the on-site visit will be reviewed, and individual Panel members will be assigned responsibility for specific topics of inquiry and for preparation of sections of the written report. If the college dean has requested that attention be given to specific aspects of the program, then that information will be presented for incorporation.

Site Visit Following review of the self-study, the Review Panel will conduct a site visit of the program. The site visit is typically one-and-a-half days in length, but may be extended if deemed desirable by the Panel or program or if a joint graduate/undergraduate review is involved. The visit includes interviews with the college dean(s), the program director, faculty, staff, students and others as appropriate. The program director does not participate in the separate interviews other than his or her own session with the Review Panel. Confidentiality must be maintained in all discussions. Additional materials may be requested by the Panel and reviewed at this time if appropriate. Time will be arranged for any faculty or staff member or student who wishes to have a private meeting with the Review Panel. The Panel will be shown the research and instructional facilities used by the program.

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

At the conclusion of the site visit, the Panel (in executive session) reviews its findings, discusses its sense of the review, and writes an initial draft of the review 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

**DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014**

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
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. An initial draft is due within two weeks, and, after resolution of any factual issues, a final draft within four weeks of the site visit. The report should provide both evaluation and constructive recommendations. The report should address the success, vitality and direction of the program and the extent to which the program is achieving its stated mission and goals. It should also analyze and evaluate inputs, productivity and outcomes by assessing specific indicators such as the characteristics of the students applying to and entering the program, the instructional and scholarly productivity of the faculty, the program's commitment to diversity, the placement of program graduates and the continued relevance of the program. To the extent the panel can authoritatively comment, there should be an evaluation of the appropriateness of the programmatic student learning outcomes for graduates in the field, and the report should explicitly describe how effective assessment of program learning outcomes has been. It is essential that all Panel members agree upon the structure and nature of the report and the responsibility for preparation of each section. The preparation of the draft and final version of the report are the responsibility of the Panel Chair.

**DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014**

The report should contain recommendations concerning the future of the program including its structure and scope of activities. These recommendations could range from a recommendation to

- discontinue a program
- restructure a program
- maintain a strong program, or
- expand a program's scope.
- Specific recommendations might be to change the direction, structure, or activities of the program in order to improve its quality, increase its effectiveness, or to utilize the university's resources more efficiently.

The initial draft of the review report is submitted to the APAA. APAA will submit the draft report to the program director and/or unit leader for review of errors in factual content. Corrections of fact (including documentation) suggested by the program director are submitted to APAA who forwards them to the review panel. After factual information has been confirmed, the final report is submitted to the APAA and to the program director.

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 review 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 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. The Council may accept the review 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 review report and accompanying materials (self-study and the response to the report) they are forwarded by the VPAA to the Provost (or designee).

Action Plan An action plan is to be prepared by the program director within three months of the review specifying how the program will address each of the Review Panel's recommendations to improve program quality. Specific metrics should be identified to monitor and demonstrate success and progress in implementing program changes.

Consideration of the Action Plan The action plan will be presented to 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 signs off on the action plan, specifying any additional issues to be

**DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014**

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.

OUTLINE FOR THE REVIEW REPORT

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 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

DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014

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

**DRAFT -- Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Reviews:
Information for Reviewers
v.10-22-2014**

Review Panel Checklist

3-6 MONTHS IN ADVANCE OF THE REVIEW

- APAA works with program to determine the date of site visit.
- Reviewer is nominated and appointed to the Review Panel.
- External Panel members are contacted by Program for travel and lodging arrangements.

2 WEEKS IN ADVANCE OF THE SITE VISIT

- Panel members receive copy of Program self-study from APAA.

THE NIGHT PRIOR TO THE SITE VISIT

- Review Panel members meet with APAA representative over a working dinner.

SITE VISIT

- Panel members participate in site visit.
- Review Panel meets in executive session to review its findings and write a draft of the report.

2 WEEKS AFTER THE SITE VISIT

- Review Panel submits an initial draft of the Panel Report (see outline, page *) to the APAA who forwards it to the program for review of errors of factual content.

3 WEEKS AFTER THE SITE VISIT

- Fact checks are due from the program.

5 WEEKS AFTER THE SITE VISIT

- Review Panel makes any needed corrections and submits the Final Report to the APAA and the program director simultaneously.