Duquesne University
Academic Program Review Guidelines
For Undergraduate and Graduate Programs
Effective March 2021

Objectives
Duquesne University will pilot a new Academic Program Review process. This pilot approach is more interactive and developmental, more focused on institutional and School priorities, more transparent regarding KPIs, and more focused on continuous improvement and accountability.

Process and Timeline
- **March: Program notification**
  The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs notifies program leadership that their APR will begin.

- **April: Provost, Dean, and Program establish an APR MOU**
  The MOU identifies the key strategic issues to be addressed in the APR and makes institutional and School priorities clear. Data and continuous improvement plans from WEAVE should be consulted.

- **May: Educational Effectiveness Kickoff workshop**
  The workshop reviews the APR process and expectations, institutional KPIs, and the Program Health Inquiry process. Program leadership and faculty review data sources and documentation, particularly in light of their MOU, and develop a plan to complete the APR. We will also discuss outcome data to assist with the development of educational effectiveness strategies and tactics, for example, ranking questions on the U.S. News and World Report surveys.

- **September: Program Economics workshop**
  Program leadership and faculty receive guidance for understanding program economics and review their data.

- **October: Enrollment Management workshop**
  Program leadership and faculty receive guidance for understanding and assessing their enrollment management activities, including marketing, recruitment, and retention. Program leadership and faculty review their actionable data for both substantive and procedural efficacy. The workshop also presents best practices and tasks programs with drafting their respective targets and action plans. Actionable data from annual WEAVE reports and other sources will be used, along with relevant dashboards and engagement with academic advisors.

- **November: Program Health Inquiry (PHI) Completed**
  Program leadership and faculty should have gathered quantitative data for the Self-study and completed the following activities:
  - Student survey administered (Appendix A)
  - Anonymous faculty survey administered (Appendix B)
  - Program Climate Scorecard completed (Appendix C)

- **February: Self-Study due (Appendix D)**
• March: External Review (Appendix E)
• April: Dean’s Report
• May: Charge from the Office of the Provost
• Departmental Continuous Improvement and Action Plan due in WEAVE September 1

Appendix A: Student Survey and Focus Group Guidelines

Appendix B: Faculty Stay Interviews/Anonymous Survey

Appendix C: Program Climate Scorecard

Appendix D: Self-study Guidelines

Appendix E: External Evaluator Guidelines

Appendix A: Student Survey and Focus Group Guidelines
The student survey and focus groups provide quantitative and qualitative input as part of the APR. The student survey should be sent to all current students enrolled in the program and completed in time for the Self-Study to be submitted by the February deadline. The PHI should include a brief summary and analysis of the student survey input and raw survey results should be included as an appendix to the PHI. The student focus group will be undertaken as part of the external review process.

Student Baseline Survey
1. How well is (insert program) preparing you to meet the following program outcomes? List Student Learning Outcomes and provide scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest.
2. Please rate the program on the following (Excellent; Good; Average; Below average; Poor)
   a. Quality of academic advising
   b. Quality of courses offered by the program (i.e., not general education or electives outside the program)
   c. Overall quality of faculty instruction in the program
   d. Faculty support and engagement outside of class
   e. Diversity and inclusion
   f. Department/program culture
3. What are the three best features of the program and why?
4. What three biggest drawbacks of the program that you would change if you could?
5. How satisfied are you with your experience in (insert program)? (Extremely satisfied; Somewhat satisfied; Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; Somewhat dissatisfied; Extremely dissatisfied)
6. If asked, how likely are you to recommend Duquesne to a potential student? (Extremely likely; Somewhat likely; Neither likely nor unlikely; Somewhat unlikely; Extremely unlikely.

Student Focus Group
The Office of the Provost will convene a reasonable number of students who are currently enrolled in the program(s) under review. The external reviewer will meet with the students over Zoom.

Appendix B: Anonymous Faculty Survey

Anonymous Survey
The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs will administer the faculty survey. Results will be summarized and shared with the program at the conclusion of the APR. The survey will be anonymous. Survey questions will address program climate and program leadership, and other topics important to faculty retention and success.

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall campus climate that you have experienced at Duquesne within the last 12 months? (Very dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neither satisfied or dissatisfied, Satisfied, Very satisfied)
2. Considering your experiences over the past 12 months, please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements
   a. I feel I belong at Duquesne
   b. Duquesne has a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion
   c. Duquesne is a place where I am able to perform up to my full potential
   d. I have opportunities at Duquesne for professional success that are similar to those of my colleagues
3. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following
   In my program I am valued for my...
      a. Teaching
      b. Research/Scholarship/Creative activity
      c. Service
      d. Mentoring of students
      e. Mentoring of faculty
      f. Clinical practice
4. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following
   a. I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department
   b. The teaching workload is fairly and equitably distributed in my department
   c. There are fair and equitable expectations regarding research in my department
   d. There are fair and equitable expectations regarding service in my department

1 Adapted from https://diversity.umich.edu/data-reports/climate-survey/.
e. There are fair and equitable processes for determining compensation in my department
f. Support is provided fairly and equitably in my department
g. Rewards for work performance are fairly and equitably distributed in my department

5. Over the past 12 months, have you experienced any discriminatory events at Duquesne because of your
   a. Ability or disability status
   b. Racial or ethnic identity
   c. Sex
d. Sexual orientation
e. Gender or gender expression
f. Age
g. Religion

6. In the past 12 months, how often have you been concerned about your physical safety on campus or around your Duquesne workplace? (Never, Seldom Sometimes, Often, Very Often)

7. Have you ever considered leaving Duquesne due to
   a. Institutional reputation
   b. Compensation
c. Campus climate

8. Likelihood of recommending Duquesne to
   a. Potential student
   b. Parents of a potential student
c. Potential faculty colleague
d. Potential staff member

9. What do you like best about your program? Why?
10. What do you like least about your program? Why?
11. What changes or improvements would you recommend? Why?
12. Excellence: rate the quality of your academic program considered nationally
    a. Exceptional. Among the very best and most selective in the country
    b. Very strong. In the top 15% of programs
c. Moderate. Solid quality, but more regional than national.
d. Below average. Improvement is needed.

13. Engagement: Please indicate your agreement with the following
    a. Program leadership and faculty collaborate a great deal with other programs (give examples)
b. There are meaningful opportunities for all program faculty to contribute to the excellence of the program
c. Our faculty are well known and respected by faculty outside our School

14. Efficacy: Please indicate your agreement with the following:
    a. All or nearly all of our faculty contribute their fair share to our program’s excellence
    b. Our program culture is healthy and functional
c. We work very well together to accomplish clear goals
d. We have clear mechanisms for decision-making as a group
e. We have of a program culture of continuous improvement

15. Leadership: Please indicate your agreement with the following:
   a. Program leader has the right temperament for their role
   b. Program leader is a strong communicator
c. Program leader is organized and advances work in a timely fashion
d. Program leader is a strategic thinker
e. Program leader motivates me to contribute my best to our program
f. Program leader responds to conflict appropriately
g. Program leader addresses conflict effectively
h. Program leader fosters an environment of mutual respect
i. Program leader is a strong communicator
j. Program leader runs effective meetings
k. Program leader takes responsibility for their mistakes
l. Program leader helps me understand our annual priorities and goals
m. Program leader effectively guides us to accomplish our goals
n. Program leader helps me understand my role in advancing the priorities or meeting the goals set by our Dean
o. Program leader helps me understand my role in advancing the priorities or meeting the goals set by our Provost
p. Program leader works collaboratively with our Dean
q. Program leader helps me understand the relationship between our activities and the higher education landscape (e.g., best practices for retention, program economics, etc.)
r. I would like the program leader to continue in this role
s. Program leader is well suited for internal advancement in academic leadership

Select Stay Interviews
If the Anonymous Survey yields predominately negative results, then Select Stay interviews will be conducted. Randomly select 3 FT faculty for stay interviews.

- What do you like most or least about working here?
- What keeps you working here?
- If you could change something about your job, what would that be?
- What would make your job more satisfying?
- How do you like to be recognized?
- What talents are not being used in your current role?
- What would you like to learn here?
- What motivates (or demotivates) you?
- What can I do to best support you?
- What might tempt you to leave?

2 Adapted from https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/hr/tmr/stay_interviews.
### Appendix C: Program Climate Scorecard

The APR process will include use of the Program Climate Scorecard below. Programs will provide evidence for each metric. The anonymous faculty survey (see Appendix B) will include opportunities for faculty share their individual perspectives on several metrics as well. Where appropriate provide both qualitative and quantitative feedback and link to departmental, school and institutional outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable distribution of teaching schedule by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All faculty are rotated through teaching assignments across the class meeting schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable assignment of teaching load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program has explicit policies approved through departmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consensus regarding procedures for assigning courses (e.g., UG vs. grad, new preparations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general education vs. electives, tenured vs. tenure track, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable distribution of time-intensive service roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program has explicit policies approved through departmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consensus regarding procedures for assigning courses time intensive service roles and for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documenting annual departmental service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable access to faculty development resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program has explicit policies approved through departmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consensus regarding access to resources such as travel funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of the full course schedule for distribution of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses are distributed across class meeting times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program economics data points are demonstrably used to inform program decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course efficiency review to maximize enrollment and schedule plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular evaluation of the student experience to remove barriers to success and student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Excellence                                  |                                                                                              |
|                                            | Percentage of faculty who engage in faculty development                                      |
|                                            | Faculty publication metrics: what about making this the percentage of                        |
|                                            | faculty who qualify for the teacher-scholar or scholar-teacher                               |
|                                            | workload)?                                                                                   |
|                                            | Faculty new course and course revision (50% or more) metrics                                |
|                                            | SES aggregate data (e.g., percentage of faculty scoring above school means)                 |
|                                            | Percentage of faculty who secure external funding                                           |
|                                            | Opportunities for experiential learning for students                                         |
| **Use of SES** | • Use of SES to show continuous improvement and/or reflection of excellence in teaching  
  • Comprehensive and continuous evaluation of all facets of the curriculum offerings, integration of practical applications and experiences to prepare students for post-graduation |

| **Engagement** | • Faculty contributions through institutional service  
  • Collaboration with other academic programs; creation of interdisciplinary programs across traditional academic boundaries linking various schools and disciplines  
  • Advancement of curricular offerings that enhance University identity  
  • Contribution to University sponsoring engagement and professional service |

| **Efficacy** | • Program provides demonstrable evidence that it is taking action to advance School and University strategic goals (e.g., strategic plan initiatives; diversity and inclusion goals; recruitment and retention goals; student success goals, etc.)  
  • Assessment of employee performance, responsibilities and goal attainment that serves institutional priorities  
  • Demonstration of evidence that considers the best interests of students as the polestar of decision-making |

---

**Appendix D: Self-study Guidelines**

**DUE BY FEBRUARY 25**

The Self-study narrative should not exceed twenty pages and should be structured as follows. Supporting data should be provided in appendices attached to the narrative.

- Executive summary: overview of findings in relation to the strategic issues and institutional priorities identified in the APR MOU (maximum of 2 pages)
- **Student Learning Achievement**
  Provide a graphic which indicates levels of student learning achievement, a summary of assessment activities, and steps to improve educational effectiveness by increasing student learning achievement and improving program assessment practices.
- **Program Health**
  Summarize key findings for the following. What did you learn? How will the data be used to make decisions and set goals?
  - Enrollment and retention, student success
  - Fiscal Strength
  - Curricular design and efficiency
  - Student satisfaction (surveys and focus groups)
  - Faculty Excellence Metrics
- Faculty satisfaction (stay interviews, anonymous survey?)
- Program outcomes: student placements in relevant employment, graduate programs; student success in competitive awards, etc.
- Program Climate Scorecard
- Leadership, succession planning and talent development
- Aligning program with institutional priorities
- Program portfolio review within and across Schools/Departments
- Preliminary goals for Departmental Continuous Improvement and Action Plan
  Briefly describe preliminary goals and plans for the next three years.

Appendix E: External Evaluator Guidelines

DUE BY MARCH 30

The program under review and the relevant Dean will provide 3-5 names for potential external reviewers. Office of the Provost will identify an external reviewer who may or may not be drawn from the list of names supplied. External reviewers will be from peer or aspirant doctoral institutions with experience and credentials that enable them to contribute knowledgeably to the review process.

Academic Affairs will provide a stipend for the external reviewer in recognition of their work.

The Office of the Provost will provide the external reviewer with a list of expectations for their work, heuristics for assessment, and a report format to standardize assessment. The external reviewer will review all PHI and Self-study materials. The external reviewer will schedule individual Zoom interviews with the department chair, faculty, the student focus group, and the Dean.

The external reviewer will prepare a 7-10 page report focusing on primarily areas for improvement and strategies related to the goals and priorities set forth in the APR MOU. The purpose of the external review is not to lobby for new resources of confirm obvious program strengths, but to assist the program with candid self-assessment and strategic thinking.

The external reviewer should submit electronic copies of the final written report to the Department Chair, Dean, and Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.