

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC PROGRAM OF STUDY REVIEW GUIDELINES
FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Revised 12.01.2011

The primary goal of an Academic Program of Study Review (APR) is to maintain and strengthen the quality of DU's undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Academic Program Reviews incorporate both an internal self-study and external site visit. Final written reports are submitted to the appropriate academic dean and the Provost. Graduate programs also present a brief oral report to the Graduate Council.

Academic Program Reviews must be conducted at least once every 7 years. However, an APR may be requested at an earlier date if deemed desirable or necessary by the department chair, dean, or Provost. The schedule for APRs is updated annually and posted on DORI under Academic Affairs. The self-study and external review should address the same program review guidelines and should provide both descriptive and evaluative information.

Degree programs which undergo specialized accreditation review meet the University requirement for Academic Program Review through that process.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Prior to beginning the self-study, the department chair schedules a meeting with the Associate Provost/AAVP for Academic Affairs to review the process and sources available to provide support and information to the committee, such as data from Enrollment Management, Institutional Research, and Academic Affairs.

The APR typically follows a 12-month timeline:

- self-study: 8 months
- external review: 2 months
- final report and recommendations: 2 months.

November 15: department chair submits documents to the dean

February 15: dean submits all materials to the Provost.

SELF-STUDY, EXTERNAL REVIEW, DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE

The Self-Study report should address the guidelines for each program of study offered by the department. Appendices may be attached to provide additional information, such as faculty C.V.s, demographic data, etc.

Departments should submit two hard copies of the following to the dean (one for the dean and one for the Provost):

- 1) Self-Study
- 2) External review team report
- 3) Departmental response to the external review team report which addresses any recommendations, etc.

DEAN'S REPORTS TO THE PROVOST

The dean should add a brief written report to the Provost which reflects his/her review of all self-study documents. The dean should then submit all four documents (self-study, external review team report, departmental response, dean's review) to the Provost.

EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

The department chair should submit recommendations for external reviewers to the dean for his/her approval prior to extending invitations and finalizing plans for a site visit. External reviewers should be from peer or aspirant doctoral institutions with experience and credentials which will enable them to contribute knowledgeably to the review process.

The Provost will provide financial support for 1 or 2 external reviewers for a two day visit on campus. In cases where multiple programs are being reviewed together (undergraduate and graduate) the Provost will provide financial support for 3 external reviewers for a two day visit on campus.

Each reviewer will be paid \$1,000 per day and will be reimbursed for travel, lodging and meals.

The external review team should be given time on Day 2 of the visit to develop their oral report and outline their findings for writing their final report later. That day they should also be scheduled for report-out meetings with the department chair, the dean, and the Provost.

The self-study and external review should address the same program review guidelines and should provide both descriptive and evaluative information.

Within 30 days of the campus site visit, external reviewers should submit digital copies of the final written report to:

1. Department Chair
2. Dean
3. Provost.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Evaluative criterion 1—Program Quality

Describe the history and mission of the program and how it complements the mission of the university. Describe program goals, number and type of degrees offered, tracks or concentrations, learning objectives and outcomes, and how the program may support other programs of the university, such as the core curriculum, Honors College, service learning, Study Abroad, undergraduate research and scholarship symposium, etc. Describe how the program compares with peer and aspirant institutions.

Evaluative criterion 2—Student Retention, Graduation, and Diversity

Describe enrollment trends for the preceding 5 years; demographics for enrolled students by class/degree level, race/ethnicity and gender, retention and graduation rates, quality and type of advising and mentoring activities for students. Discuss any notable diversity initiatives, outreach for minority students and faculty, efforts to support recruitment and retention.

Evaluative criterion 3—Student Learning Outcomes

Describe your assessment processes and show how assessment of student learning outcomes has resulted in changes in the curriculum, teaching methods, or resource allocation (budget, personnel, staff or faculty time). Provide as much information as possible about the placement of students after graduation and alumni satisfaction with the program for the preceding 5 years.

Evaluative criterion 4—Program/Curriculum Planning and Review

Describe the processes employed by the faculty for curriculum review, planning, and revision. Discuss how the curriculum provides sufficient breadth and depth for the baccalaureate degree. Describe learning opportunities for students beyond the classroom, such as internships, observations, etc. and how those interactions support the learning goals for the program.

Evaluative criterion 5—Adequacy of Human, Financial, and Physical Resources

Is the program able to meet its learning goals with the current level of resources provided by the library, facilities, information technology, etc.? Describe the activities of the faculty in terms of scholarship, teaching, and service to the department, school, and university. Describe the resources and support available to support faculty development and to mentor junior faculty. Are there sufficient faculty members to meet the goals of the department in each of these areas? To ensure adequate or desirable levels of full-time faculty coverage for teaching and mentoring undergraduate students in both lower-division and upper-division classes? Is the budget support for the program adequate?

Evaluative criterion 6—Criteria determined by the school

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Evaluative criterion 1 - Program Quality

1. Does the mission of the program contribute to the mission of the school and university?
2. How does the program compare to similar benchmark programs of which you are aware? When possible, please be specific about the benchmark programs being used for comparison.
3. Based on your knowledge, please describe the primary competitors for this program. Where appropriate, please include local, national, or international competitors.
4. Based on your knowledge of similar programs, where would you place this program in a national standing?

Evaluative criterion 2 - Student Quality and Recruitment

1. Is the program using effective recruiting strategies to bring the best and brightest students to the program?
2. Are the average entering admission requirements sufficient to promote success in the graduate program?
3. Is the acceptance ratio of students commensurate with graduate programs of similar focus and size?
4. Is the diversity of the student body within the graduate program commensurate with programs of similar focus and size?
5. Is the financial support for students sufficient to promote success of the program and the students within the program?

Evaluative criterion 3 - Student Productivity and Matriculation

1. Is the enrollment pattern within the program consistent with programs of similar size and focus? Enrollment pattern includes numbers of students at different stages of matriculation and the status of the students (e.g. part-time or full-time).
2. Is the retention/graduation rate consistent with reasonable program rigor and fairness to the students within the program?
3. Is the number of degrees awarded annually reasonable given the rigor of the program, the enrollment pattern, and the focus and size of the program?
4. Is the time taken to earn the degree commensurate with programs of similar focus and reasonable given the enrollment pattern of the program?

Evaluative criterion 4 - Learning Outcomes

1. Does the program have a process for assessing learning outcomes? Is there a process for evaluating student satisfaction with the program?
2. Are the grade distributions, including the annual number of I-grades and W-grades, indicative of a high achievement of learning outcomes?
3. Is student performance on outcome-based exams (e.g. comprehensive exams, licensing exams, certification exams) consistent with a high level of learning?

4. Is the placement of students after graduation consistent with a program that is recognized by employers/educators as accomplishing its learning objectives?
5. Is the feedback from the program's alumni consistent with achievement of learning outcomes at graduation?

Evaluative criterion 5 - Program Curriculum

1. Are there processes in place for curriculum review, planning and revision?
2. Are the program curricular goals consistent with the mission of the program?
3. Are the program curricular goals consistent with the goals and objectives of courses within the curriculum?
4. Is there a process for assessing learning goals within the curriculum?

Evaluative criterion 6 - Adequacy of Resources (not including budget of the program)

1. Are there adequate library resources to support the program?
2. Are there adequate laboratory, computer, student and faculty facilities to support the program?

Evaluative criterion 7 - Faculty Productivity

1. Is the number of faculty publications consistent with successful programs of similar size and focus?
2. If research funding is required to complete research within the program, is that funding sufficient for success of the graduate program?
3. Have scholarly awards been granted to the faculty of the program indicating their success in scholarship?
4. Are faculty of the program serving as chairs and committee members on thesis and dissertation committees at a level commensurate with success of the graduate program and the faculty member?
5. Is the number of students mentored by faculty commensurate with quality graduate education?

Evaluative criterion 8 - Fiscal Management

1. Describe the financial support the program provides for its graduate students.
2. Include comparative data and Library support.
3. Is the number of faculty and staff reasonable for the program:
Faculty/student FTE?
4. Is the operating budget/faculty FTE ratio commensurate with successful programs of similar size and focus?
5. Is the research expenditure/faculty FTE ratio commensurate with successful programs of similar size and focus?

Evaluative criterion 9 – Criteria Unique to School