

Academic Program Review Manual

**Department of Institutional Effectiveness
Winthrop University**

Revised: Spring 2026

Academic Program Review (APR) Manual

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| History of Academic Program Reviews at Winthrop University | 1 |
| Purpose of Academic Program Reviews | 1 |
| Types of Academic Program Reviews | 2 |
| Program Review Process – Overview | 2 |
| Timeline | 3 |
| Roles and Responsibilities..... | 3 |
| Office of the Provost..... | 4 |
| Department of Institutional Effectiveness..... | 4 |
| Academic Colleges/Schools | 4 |
| School of Graduate, Continuing, and Online Education | 7 |
| Program Review Process – Details | 7 |
| Self-Study | 7 |
| External Review | 8 |
| Action Plan | 9 |
| Documentation | 10 |
| Appendix A – Self-Study Outline..... | 11 |
| Appendix B – Faculty Roster Form..... | 17 |
| Appendix C – Example – External Review Team On-Site Visit Agenda..... | 18 |
| Appendix D – External Review Team Report Outline | 21 |
| Appendix E – Action Plan | 22 |

History of Academic Program Reviews at Winthrop University

Winthrop University has undertaken Academic Program Review (APR) since the 1980s. Guidelines for conducting APR were initially developed by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE), with input from academic officers at each of the state’s public higher education institutions. Until December 2000, CHE coordinated a statewide review of academic offerings in disciplines without specialized accrediting entities. At that time, state budget cuts forced CHE to abandon such reviews, except those related to teacher certification or teacher advancement. In March 2010, CHE dissolved its partnership with the South Carolina Department of Education and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Winthrop elected to continue conducting program reviews. More specifically, Winthrop uses a decision-making model for academic program reviews, one that features both qualitative and quantitative data elements, emphasizes accountability, demonstrates alignment of programs with institutional missions and goals, and uses results to inform actions and resource allocation (i.e., financial, personnel, physical facilities).

Winthrop University uses program reviews to support the institution’s narrative response to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Comprehensive Standard 8.2 – Student Achievement, during both the Decennial Review and the Fifth-Year Interim Review. This standard requires that “the institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results.” (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. 2024. *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement.*). Documentation from program reviews (i.e., Self-Study, External Review Team Report, Action Plan) constitutes one of Winthrop’s expected measures for demonstrating student learning and success within an academic program.

Purpose of Academic Program Reviews

Program reviews foster continuous academic excellence and quality improvements in Winthrop University’s academic programs, thereby supporting Winthrop’s strategic plan. Furthermore, academic program reviews ensure that Winthrop University preserves its reputation for crafting and maintaining high-quality academic programs consistent with emerging best practices and affirm that program priorities are aligned with and support the achievement of WU’s institutional mission, goals, and strategic priorities.

Academic program reviews assist in the long-term planning efforts of the faculty, deans, and Provost by providing a thorough assessment of a program’s comparative advantage within the discipline, strengths, and opportunities. In preparing the Self-Study, reviewing data, and examining evidentiary documents, the APR affords the program an opportunity to

- review policies, practices, procedures, and records to improve its operations,
- clarify goals, assess goal achievement, review program resources, identify concerns, and suggest potential changes, and

- articulate its needs and justify its requests for program enhancements.

Types of Academic Program Reviews

Institutional Program Review

The intent of an institutional program review is to evaluate the entire program, including student learning outcomes. Reviews occur on a regular cycle, usually every five to seven years. An academic program conducts a Self-Study to assess its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and concerns in the areas of quality, demand, and resources. An External Review Team assesses the Self-Study and conducts an on-campus visit, identifying programmatic strengths and areas for improvement. Based on the Self-Study and the External Review Team Report, the academic program designs an Action Plan to enhance program quality and student learning.

Institutional APR guidelines and timelines may be modified through consultation with the appropriate college dean and the Office of the Provost. Decisions to modify the APR schedule are based on various considerations, including, but not limited to, pending program revisions, changes in program leadership, and budgetary constraints.

Accreditation Program Review

An academic program review by an accrediting agency may be substituted for an institutional program review if certain criteria are met, including an outcome-based approach, substantial involvement of Winthrop program faculty in the review process, and an external review by a discipline-based team representing the accrediting agency. A review of program outcomes, student learning outcomes, assessment processes, and evidence-based decision-making must be included in the External Review Team Report. A program's request for submitting a review from an accrediting agency in place of an institutional program review is subject to approval by the appropriate college dean and the Office of the Provost.

Program Review Process – Overview

The two-year academic program review process encompasses self-reflection, internal and external reviews, and a planning stage. The **first phase** of an academic program review is the development of a written Self-Study, generally the responsibility of a programmatic committee. The dean or designee meets with program faculty to facilitate the college's organizational processes for the specific program review. Through a fully participatory process, all program faculty are involved in the review process and given the opportunity to provide meaningful input into the program's Self-Study.

The **second phase** of the process involves an External Review Team reviewing the Self-Study and conducting an on-site visit or virtual meetings. A written External Review Team Report is submitted, recognizing the program's strengths and offering recommendations for improvement.

The **third phase** of an academic program review is the creation of a program Action Plan, using the results of the Self-Study and the External Review Team's findings to enhance program quality and

student learning, and to inform resource allocations. Developed by the program faculty members, with the approval of the dean, the Action Plan articulates objectives, actions, timelines, responsible individuals, resources, and assessment strategies. The Self-Study, External Review Team Report, Accreditor’s Decision Letter, and Action Plan are submitted to and archived by the University’s Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. The program and the college also maintain a copy of these documents.

Timeline

The academic program review process follows the general schedule and procedures outlined below, however, an academic college may choose to enact a more stringent timeline.

- **Year 0 – Spring semester** – Faculty involved in leading a program review attend an institutional orientation meeting with the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and an appropriate representative from the respective dean’s office. The purpose of the meeting is to familiarize program faculty with the program review process. Subsequently, the college dean or designee convenes a program-specific meeting to establish the planning process and to assign tasks to responsible individuals.
- **Year 1 – Fall semester** – Program faculty write the Self-Study and collect supporting documentation. A draft of the Self-Study is submitted to the dean for review by the end of the fall semester.
- **Year 1 – Spring semester** – The dean reviews the program’s Self-Study draft and returns it to the program for further editing, if necessary. The final Self-Study is due to the dean and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness by the end of the spring semester. Suggested members of the External Review Team are identified, and names are submitted to the dean and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness for review. Appropriate External Review Team members are contacted by the end of the spring semester, and dates for the on-site or electronic visit are determined.
- **Year 2 – Fall semester** – Visit by the External Review Team (ERT). The Self-Study is provided to the ERT members at least four weeks before the on-site visit or virtual meetings. The ERT submits the written External Review Team Report to the program director/ department chair four to six weeks after the on-site visit. The Self-Study and the External Review Team Report are submitted to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness for archiving.
- **Year 2 – Spring semester** – Program faculty develop an Action Plan based on the Self-Study and the External Review Team Report. The dean approves the Plan and submits it to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness by the end of the spring semester.

Roles and Responsibilities

The academic review process requires collaboration among institutional units and offices, as well as with community members. Planning successful reviews involves shared responsibilities across all major stakeholders. Implementing improvements based upon the results of the review process is a matter of

mutual accountability.

The college dean is responsible for initiating the academic review process and providing college-level oversight and facilitation. The Office of the Provost provides institutional oversight and facilitation of the review process.

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Provost

- Meets with the External Review Team (ERT) during the onsite review.
- Confers with the dean regarding follow-up action plans and resource allocations.

DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

- Provides orientation, consultation, and support to Self-Study teams, in concert with the dean and program director/department chair.
- Confers with the dean regarding the academic program review schedule and any changes as requested by the dean, based on program director/department chair input.
- Furnishes oversight and monitors progress of the review process.
- Reviews the Self-Study and provides feedback to the dean and the academic program.
- Evaluates candidates, in consultation with the dean, for inclusion on the External Review Team.
- Meets with the External Review Team and a representative from the dean's office regarding programmatic assessment efforts.
- Attends the exit meeting conducted by the External Review Team.
- Retains copies of the program's Self-Study, External Review Team Report, Accreditor's Decision Letter, and Action Plan.

ACADEMIC COLLEGES/SCHOOLS

Dean or Designee

- Identifies programs to be reviewed.
- Attends the Program Review Orientation conducted by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness.
- Facilitates an organizational meeting of the program faculty to plan and initiate the review process.
- Approves selection of the Self-Study Committee.
- Reviews a draft of the Self-Study, providing timely feedback to the academic program.
- Approves the final Self-Study prior to its submission to the External Review Team.

- Recommends members to the External Review Team, in conjunction with the program director/department chair and program faculty, to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. Recommendation to include each prospective reviewer’s qualifications, including academic and professional experiential background.
- Contacts approved prospective members of the External Review Team for willingness and availability to serve.
- Approves the itinerary for the External Review Team visit.
- Attends the exit meeting conducted by the External Review Team and other meetings, as appropriate.
- Sends the External Review Team Report and Accreditor’s Decision Letter to the Office of the Provost.
- Reviews and approves the Action Plan, developed by the program director/department chair and program faculty.
- Conveys electronic copies of the Self-Study Report, External Review Team Report, Action Plans, Decision Letters, and all supporting documentation to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness for institutional archiving.

The following describes the program review responsibilities of the academic college/school. Each college/school should assign the appropriate individual(s) (e.g., program director, department chair, assessment coordinator, Self-Study Committee chair, Self-Study Committee, program faculty) to these specific responsibilities, based on the college/school's internal structure and functionality. The following outlines one possible approach to distribution of the program review responsibilities.

Program Director/Department Chair

- Attends the Program Review Orientation conducted by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness and the organizational/planning meeting facilitated by the college dean or designee.
- Recommends membership and chair of the Self-Study Committee to the dean. The Committee generally is composed of three to six individuals, including program/department faculty, liaison librarian, program’s assessment coordinator, and at least one student representative and a graduate of the program, if feasible.
- Coordinates Self-Study preparations and ensures satisfactory and timely completion.
- Approves and forwards the Self-Study to the dean for review.
- Nominates, in consultation with the dean and Self-Study Committee, potential members of the External Review Team.
- Contacts Ida Jane Dacus Library to request library review elements at least six weeks before information is needed for the Self-Study.
- Communicates with the Office of Institutional Research for data needs and submits, if

necessary, a Data Request Form (https://winthrop.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_dmTz6xRb7oHVooJ) at least six weeks before information is needed for the Self-Study.

- Develops the itinerary for the External Review Team visit, in conjunction with the program's Self-Study Committee.
- Facilitates transporting and escorting the External Review Team to and from campus.
- Attends the exit meeting conducted by the External Review Team.
- Provides a written response to the External Review Team addressing factual errors, if any, within the External Review Team Report.
- Drafts, in conjunction with the program faculty, and monitors implementation of the Action Plan, resulting from the Self-Study and the External Review Team Report. Communicates progress to the dean as part of the Annual Report.

Self-Study Committee Chair

- Attends the Program Review Orientation conducted by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness and the organizational/planning meeting facilitated by the college dean or designee.
- Meets with the program director/department chair to discuss questions and issues related to the development of and revisions to the Self-Study.
- Assigns sub-committees to address sections of the Self-Study, as appropriate.
- Develops timelines and monitors progress of the Self-Study.
- Submits the Self-Study to the program director/department chair, following the established timeline.

Self-Study Committee

- Ensures the opportunity for input on the Self-Study process from the entire program faculty, including those not serving directly on the committee.
- Completes the Self-Study following the established guidelines and timeline.
- Revises Self-Study draft based on feedback provided by the program director/department chair, dean, and Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness.
- Advises program director/department chair on potential External Review Team members.
- Proposes a schedule for the External Review Team visit (onsite or virtual meetings) in consultation with the program director/department chair.
- Presents an overview of the program to the External Review Team during the opening meeting of the onsite or virtual visit.

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE, CONTINUING, AND ONLINE EDUCATION

A graduate program undergoing an academic program review has responsibilities to the School of Graduate, Continuing, and Online Education as outlined below.

Dean

- Reviews and evaluates, in conjunction with the University Graduate Assessment Committee, a graduate program's assessment matrix demonstrating compliance with SACSCOC standard 9.6 (post-baccalaureate rigor and curriculum).

Graduate Program Director (program-specific)

- Updates and submits an assessment matrix demonstrating compliance with SACSCOC standard 9.6 (post-baccalaureate rigor and curriculum) to the Graduate School Dean. The matrix is submitted two years prior to the graduate program's scheduled academic review.
- Addresses any concerns, prior to the academic program review, arising from the Dean of the School of Graduate, Continuing, and Online Education and the University Graduate Assessment Committee's review of the assessment matrix.
- Ensures any changes made to the program, based on the assessment matrix review, are reflected in the program's Self-Study.

Program Review Process – Details

Self-Study

The Self-Study provides relevant programmatic information reflecting the time period since the prior program review submission. The report is expected to be comprehensive, providing information that ranges from descriptive to analytical and evaluative. Supporting documentation is to be thorough and comprehensive.

The Self-Study addresses the following topic areas:

1. Mission and History
2. Program Goals and Objectives – Strategic Focus
3. Program Structure and Dynamism
4. Program Viability and Strategic Direction
5. Program Role within the College and the University
6. Faculty Role within the Program
7. Student Learning Assessment
8. Student and Alumni Role within the Program
9. Academic and Administrative Support
10. Overall Program Evaluation
11. Areas for Additional Review and Consulting by the External Review Team

Appendix A, *Self-Study Outline*, provides a detailed description of the items addressed within each topic area. Additionally, the *Self-Study Outline* includes a reference to **Appendix B**, the *Faculty Roster Form*.

A program undertaking an accreditation program review completes the template provided by the accrediting body for its Self-Study Report.

External Review

The External Review provides an opportunity for program faculty and administrators to gain a perspective on the program's strengths and weaknesses from academicians and practitioners outside the university. The primary responsibility of these individuals is to review the program's Self-Study and to meet with various constituencies associated with the academic program. **Appendix C** provides an example of an *External Review Team On-Site Visit Agenda*. Upon completing their work, external reviewers produce an External Review Team Report that identifies program strengths and provides recommendations for improvement. **Appendix D** contains the *External Report Team Report Outline*. For a program conducting an accreditation program review, the On-Site Team will use the accreditor's report template.

The **External Review Team** is generally composed of two individuals, but its size may range from one to three people. Based on program faculty recommendations, the dean provides a roster of select reviewers to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness for approval. Winthrop University does not knowingly select an off-campus person for inclusion on an External Review Team if the evaluator:

- Has been, within the last ten years, a compensated consultant, an appointee or employee of the institution, or has been a candidate within the past five years for employment at the university.
- Has a close personal or familial relationship with people at the institution or a strong bias regarding the university.
- Is a member of an association or professional activity that a reasonable person might conclude would impede rendering an impartial, objective, and professional judgment.

Criteria for selecting external reviewers may include recognition and distinction in the discipline, professional rank at the associate level or higher, administrative and/or program review experience, and involvement in a program or educational initiative of special interest to the program under review. Efforts should be made to submit nominees from southeastern regional institutions to minimize travel costs and ensure members of the External Review Team are aware of reporting obligations, transparency, and evidentiary expectations of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

For an accreditation program review, the accrediting body determines the External Review Team/On-Site Visiting Team.

External Review Team Chair

- Gathers and distributes supplemental information as requested by team members prior to the visit.
- Notifies the program director/department chair of additional persons requested by the External Review Team for interviewing during the visit.
- Reviews the visit schedule and discusses any needed changes with the program director/department chair.
- Chairs the interview process, ensuring that schedules and timelines are followed.
- Assigns team members writing responsibilities and deadlines for sections of the External Review Team Report, following the outline of the Self-Study.
- Composes the final External Review Team Report.
- Submits the External Review Team Report to the program director/department chair within four to six weeks of the onsite or virtual visit.

External Review Team

- Reads the Self-Study and identifies any issues or additional information needed before the visit.
- Interviews (on-site or virtually) faculty members, students, and administrators with a direct impact on the program.
- Provides substantive comments and recommendations regarding each major area addressed in the Self-Study.
- Acts as consultants to the program by providing information and expertise based on their experience and involvement with similar programs.
- Participates in the writing and editing of the External Review Team Report.

Within three weeks of receiving the External Review Team Report, the program director/department chair and the dean provide a written response to the External Review Team Chair addressing any factual errors in the report. For a program conducting an accreditation program review, the accrediting body will determine the timeline for a programmatic response to the On-Site Visiting Team Report.

Action Plan

Within three months of receiving the External Review Team Report or the Accreditor's Decision Letter, the program director/department chair and program faculty, with input and approval from the college dean, complete an Action Plan based on the Self-Study and the External Review Team Report/On-Site Visiting Team Report. The Action Plan reflects the program's use of findings to improve both program quality and student learning. The Action Plan outlines specific actions, reasons for the actions (e.g., reference to a specific recommendation or observation), individuals responsible for carrying out the actions, a timeline for implementation of the actions, required resources, and an assessment component to gauge the impact of the actions. **Appendix E** provides an *Action Plan* template.

Action Plans are integrated into the program's annual Continuous Improvement Report and the department's annual report, reflecting alignment with the college and institutional strategic initiatives and the budgeting process.

Documentation

The dean conveys electronic copies of the Self-Study Report, the External Review Team Report/On-Site Visiting Team Report, the Accreditor's Decision Letter, the Action Plan, and all supporting documentation to the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. The program and the college also maintain a copy of these documents.

Appendix A

Self-Study Outline

The Self-Study is organized according to the following outline. The program may supplement the prescribed outline with additional sections that focus on relevant issues within the program, if appropriate. ***The review should reflect the years since the previous program review.***

In completing the Self-Study, respond to each item, using tables and bullets where appropriate, and provide relevant and sufficient supporting documentation. Although some portions of the narrative may be descriptive, analysis and evaluation are to be emphasized throughout the document.

I. Table of Contents

II. Executive Summary

III. Narrative

1. Mission and History

- a. State a brief program history. Include the current position of the academic program within the organizational structure of the college/school and the university. Indicate any significant changes in the program since the previous program review.
- b. Provide the mission statement of the program, college/school, and university, and describe how the program's mission supports that of the college/school and the university.
- c. Summarize how the previous program review recommendations have been used to inform various aspects of the program (e.g., refinement of mission, goals, or objectives; program planning, development, and improvement; student support services; advising; budgeting decisions).
- d. Identify all tracks, concentrations, or specializations associated with the program, and types of credentials awarded.
- e. Indicate the current number of faculty, support staff, majors, and minors (per each track, concentration, specialization, and type of credential).

Suggested Documentation: Annual Reports (documenting significant changes in the program and how previous reviews have informed the program); data on personnel and students; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

2. Program Goals and Objectives – Strategic Focus

- a. Outline the program's goals and objectives. (Note: Goals are broad in scope and set direction for the program. Objectives describe what is to be accomplished to achieve the goals.)
- b. Identify the program's key performance indicators (KPIs) that track goal and objective

attainment.

- c. Explain how the program's goals and objectives support and advance the college's/school's and the university's strategic goals and initiatives, including the University Level Competencies (ULCs).
- d. Describe the major activities that supported progress in achieving program goals and objectives. Indicate the success of these activities in advancing the program's goals and objectives.
- e. Discuss the program's goals and aspirations for the next five to seven years.

Suggested Documentation: program's/college's/school's current strategic plan or initiatives; documents related to major activities advancing the program's goals and objectives; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

3. Program Structure and Dynamism

- a. Outline the program requirements and curriculum design. Indicate recent curriculum changes, their purpose, and any plans for future changes.
- b. Address the coherence and integrity of the curriculum when compared to standards of best practice, as determined by discipline-based national societies.
- c. Demonstrate the program's curriculum compliance with SACSCOC standard 9.6 (post-baccalaureate rigor and curriculum) for graduate programs, if applicable.
- d. Discuss any curricular issues that impede student progress toward timely degree completion. Discuss how the program has or is planning to alleviate these problems.
- e. Illustrate instructional innovation within the program.
- f. Explain the impact of online education offerings on the program, if applicable.
- g. Identify the educational, professional, and career goals a student can aspire to as a program graduate.
- h. Describe the nimbleness and responsiveness of the curriculum to evolving societal needs and, therefore, to the needs of current and future students.

Suggested Documentation: links to undergraduate/graduate catalog; course descriptions; course syllabi; curriculum actions; roster of online courses (hybrid and fully); documentation to support graduate academic rigor; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

4. Program Viability and Strategic Direction

- a. Describe what is unique about Winthrop's program compared to other programs in South Carolina and comparable regional programs.
- b. Discuss the placement of graduates within the professional sector or graduate school, including the number of program graduates living in South Carolina, elsewhere in the United

States, and internationally. Report on student performance on licensure/certification exams, if applicable.

- c. Determine current student demand for the program using enrollment, retention and completion metrics by year, class level, and degree completions. Report annual credit hour production in courses required of majors by full-time faculty and part-time faculty.
- d. Compare the size and focus of Winthrop's degree program to similar programs in the state and region. Citing state, regional, national, and/or discipline-specific data sources, discuss potential needs for expansion, revision, contraction, or elimination of tracks, concentrations, specializations, or the program.
- e. Explain how the field/discipline may evolve in the next five years and how the program envisions responding to these changes.

Suggested Documentation: information on comparable programs; data on graduates; data on students; data sources (e.g., IPEDS, U.S. Department of Labor, professional organizations); other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

5. Program Role within the College/School and the University

- a. Discuss the role of the program in supporting other college/school and university units, such as other undergraduate or graduate programs, minor offerings, cross-disciplinary programs, non-majors, and related types of support.
- b. If the program supports the university's General Education Program, describe the relationship and level of involvement. Include the following information for all appropriate general education courses (including the general education core courses):
 - i. Name of course and course designator
 - ii. The area of general education supported (e.g., global perspective, natural science, oral communication)
 - iii. Semester of course delivery
 - iv. Number of sections taught
 - v. Name of faculty member who taught each section and their status as full- or part-time
 - vi. Annual credit hour production in support of the General Education Program for each discipline-based course
 - vii. Annual program credit hour production in support of the General Education Program
- c. If the program supports the university's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), report on the amount of program faculty time used to support this initiative. Include the following information for all appropriate QEP courses taught:
 - i. Name of course and course designator

- ii. Semester of course delivery
- iii. Number of sections taught
- iv. Name of faculty member who taught each section and their status as full- or part-time
- v. Annual credit hour production in support of the QEP for each discipline-based course
- vi. Annual program credit hour production in support of the QEP

Suggested Documentation: data in support of other academic programs; General Education data; QEP data; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

6. Faculty Role within the Program

- a. Discuss the qualifications (academic and experiential) of faculty directly responsible for ensuring the quality and integrity of the program. Complete and include the faculty qualifications template, available in **Appendix B** within this section. Faculty information is extracted from PICS, the institutional faculty credentialing application maintained by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness and updated by the deans' offices. After spring 2026, PICS will be replaced by Watermark, which will continue to be maintained by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness and updated by the deans' offices.
- b. Provide the programmatic responsibilities of full-time faculty and discuss the adequacy of the number of full-time program faculty to fulfill these responsibilities.
- c. Describe significant faculty achievements in teaching, advising, research and/or creative activity, service and support activities, and outreach and civic engagement activities.
- d. Highlight faculty involvement in governance, committee, and administrative responsibilities in the program, school/college, and university. If any of these activities result in reassigned time, report the amount of time per individual faculty member.
- e. Present a summary of external research funding obtained, including awards to support future research.
- f. Explain the role of part-time faculty in supporting teaching, service, and scholarship within the program, as appropriate.
- g. Address the mentoring and evaluation process for junior faculty. Describe evaluation processes for tenured faculty, to include senior faculty.
- h. Identify professional development opportunities afforded to tenured, tenure-track, and part-time faculty. Include the types of activities and the individuals participating.
- i. Summarize the effectiveness of efforts to recruit and retain program faculty from underrepresented groups.

Suggested Documentation: faculty qualifications roster (Appendix B); external research funding

data; Faculty Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; professional development data; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

7. Student Learning Assessment

- a. Describe the role of program faculty and staff in assessing student learning.
- b. List the program's student learning outcomes (SLOs) and address any major changes made to the SLOs since the previous program review.
- c. Explain, if applicable, the advanced nature of a graduate program in comparison to a corresponding undergraduate program, specifically addressing program requirements regarding (1) knowledge of the discipline's literature and (2) discipline-appropriate research and/or professional practice.
- d. Identify types of assessments used, timing of the assessments (e.g., introductory course, capstone course), and assessment tools.
- e. Discuss student progress in attaining the student learning outcomes, based on analysis and interpretation of assessment data.
- f. Indicate the use of results to improve student learning, as well as future programmatic changes being considered based on assessment results.
- g. Address the value and effectiveness of the program's assessment activities, including the assessment tools and procedures.

Suggested Documentation: program's curriculum map; Continuous Improvement Reports; assessment tools; summary documents related to use of data for enhancement of student learning; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

8. Student and Alumni Role within the Program

- a. Summarize the effectiveness of program efforts to recruit and retain students, both to the institution and the program.
- b. Discuss the level of student engagement in program affairs, including student organizations.
- c. Indicate strategies in place to encourage student involvement in research, inquiry processes, and/or creative endeavors in their field, and the opportunities afforded students to interact with faculty in the pursuit of research and/or creative activities. Provide a summary of student research projects.
- d. Highlight student involvement in other high-impact practices, such as internships and service learning, provided and/or supported by the program.
- e. Explain the academic and pre-career advising services the program faculty provide to students. Discuss how advising services are assessed and improvements made based on student feedback. Address mechanisms for training, mentoring, and evaluating program

advisors.

- f. Assess student perception of the program, to include quality of teaching. Describe the data sources.
- g. Describe the involvement of alumni with the program.
- h. Address alumni perception of the program, including program effectiveness. Describe the data sources.

Suggested Documentation: high-impact practices student roster; documentation to support advising efforts; summaries of student evaluations of teaching and the program; summaries of alumni evaluations of the program; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

9. Academic and Administrative Support

- a. Address the adequacy of program staffing using discipline norms and best practices for comparisons. Consider the following: exempt and non-exempt staff, graduate assistants, and student workers.
- b. Assess library resources, indicating the quantity and quality of information, and the extent to which students and faculty can access and use relevant materials.
- c. Describe the level of technological support and its adequacy in meeting the program needs.
- d. Evaluate the adequacy of facilities utilized by the program, including classrooms, labs, studios, other instructional facilities, and office space.
- e. Appraise the adequacy of non-personnel-based support (e.g., operating budget, grants, foundation money).

Suggested Documentation: facility and equipment descriptions or related information; academic unit budget information; other documents as deemed appropriate by the program to support this section of the narrative

10. Overall Program Evaluation

- a. Identify the program's strengths in terms of productivity, viability, and quality.
- b. Identify the program's weaknesses in terms of productivity, viability, and quality.
- c. Discuss the program's current recommendations for improvement in terms of productivity, viability, and quality.

11. Areas for Additional Review and Consulting by the External Review Team

- a. Based on the Self-Study, identify two or three areas in which external consulting could benefit the program. Considering these areas, list specific critical questions for the External Review Team to consider and respond to during their review and on-site visit/virtual

meetings. Explain how addressing these questions will facilitate program improvement and planning efforts.

Appendix B

Faculty Roster Form

Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

(Faculty information is to be downloaded from PICS/Watermark.)

| FACULTY NAME Full-time or Part-time | COURSES TAUGHT Prior Two Years and Year of Self-Study | HIGHEST DEGREE and COURSEWORK Relevant to Courses Taught | OTHER QUALIFICATIONS Relevant to Courses Taught |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Appendix C

Example – External Review Team On-Site Visit Agenda

External Review Team (ERT) on-site visits are usually scheduled over three days, with team members arriving the afternoon of day 1 and departing the afternoon of day 3, depending on their availability. Specific activities and meetings associated with each review may vary depending on the program's nature and needs.

For programs conducting an accreditation program review, the on-site visit agenda will follow the protocol established by the accrediting body.

Mandatory meetings include:

- Faculty
- Students
- Alumni
- Dean
- Assessment (Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and a representative from the dean's office)
- Provost

Additional meetings, as appropriate to the program, include:

- Academic Support Services
- Dacus Library
- Career Services
- Advising
- School of Graduate, Continuing, and Online Education
- Outreach Programs
- Program Advisory Boards
- Other

The following example of an on-site meeting agenda serves as a baseline, ensuring basic consistency across academic program reviews. The schedule may be adjusted to meet the needs of the program, the External Review Team, or the accrediting body.

External Review Team – Visit Agenda

Name of Program

Date

Day 1, Date

- 2:45PM Program Director/Department Chair meets External Review Team (ERT) at hotel lobby for drive to WU
- 3:00-6:00PM Orientation to review process and review of program documents – Room TBD
Tour of campus and program facilities
- 6:00-8:30PM Dinner and overview of program – Room TBD
Attendees: External Review Team, Dean of the College/School, Program Director/Department Chair, Self-Study Committee

Day 2, Date

- 8:15AM Program Director/Department Chair meets ERT at hotel lobby for drive to WU
- 8:30-8:50AM ERT meets to organize itself for meetings and interviews – Room TBD
- 9:00-9:45AM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 10:00-10:45AM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 11:00-11:45AM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 11:45-1:00PM Lunch – Location TBD
- 1:00-1:45PM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 2:00-2:30PM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 2:45-3:15PM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 3:15-3:30PM Break
- 3:30-4:00PM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 4:15-5:00PM Meet with _____ – Room TBD
- 5:00-6:00PM Team Meeting – Room TBD
- 6:15-8:00PM External Review Team Dinner and Meeting – Location TBD

Day 3, Date

- 8:15AM Program Director/Department Chair meets ERT at hotel lobby for drive to WU
- 8:30-10:30AM External Review Team compiles preliminary findings – Room TBD
- 10:30-11:30AM External Review Team conducts Exit Interview with Dean, Program Director/Department Chair, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, and others as appropriate – Room TBD

Appendix D

External Review Team Report Outline

The External Review Team Report is to follow the outline below, supplementing additional sections, as appropriate.

The On-Site Visiting Team Report for an accrediting body will reflect the standards required for compliance.

Executive Summary

1. Identification of major findings and recommendations

Narrative – Reviewers’ response/assessment of the following topic areas:

1. Mission and History
2. Program Goals and Objectives – Strategic Focus
3. Program Structure and Dynamism
4. Program Viability and Strategic Direction
5. Program Role within the College/School and the University
6. Faculty Role within the Program
7. Student Learning Assessment
8. Student and Alumni Role within the Program
9. Academic and Administrative Support
10. Overall Program Evaluation

Appendix E

Action Plan

The program generates an Action Plan within three months of receiving the External Review Team Report or the accreditor’s On-Site Visiting Team Report. Based on the Self-Study and the External Review Team Report/accreditor’s On-Site Visiting Team Report, the program’s Action Plan provides a strategic map for the next five to seven years.

The Action Plan reflects the program’s use of findings to improve both program quality and student learning. The Action Plan includes specific actions, reasons for the actions (e.g., references to specific recommendations or observations), individuals responsible for carrying them out, a timeline for implementing the actions, required resources, and an assessment component to gauge the actions' impact.

A narrative explanation of the Action Plan is appropriate, supported by a tabular summarization. The table below is a suggested tool for providing an overall summary of the Action Plan. ***This table, or a modification that better meets the program's needs and ensures use, is appropriate to include in the Action Plan.***

Name of Program
Action Plan – Program Review 20XX-XX

| |
|--|
| Action Item: |
| Rationale for Action: |
| Detailed Description of Action: |
| Responsible Individual(s): |
| Timeline: |
| Resources Required: |
| Assessment Methods/Impact: |
| Dates for Status Updates: |
| Action Item: |
| Rationale for Action: |
| Detailed Description of Action: |
| Responsible Individual(s): |
| Timeline: |
| Resources Required: |

| |
|--|
| Assessment Methods/Impact: |
| Dates for Status Updates: |
| Action Item: |
| Rationale for Action: |
| Detailed Description of Action: |
| Responsible Individual(s): |
| Timeline: |
| Resources Required: |
| Assessment Methods/Impact: |
| Dates for Status Updates: |