

**MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY**

**GUIDELINES**

**UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PROGRAM  
REVIEW**

**Summer 2008  
Final Edition**

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Purpose	3
II. Administrative Definitions and Procedures	4
III. The Self Study	7
A. Program Profile Information: Mandatory	8
A. Program Profile Information: Optional	12
B. Faculty and Support Profile	13
C. Student Learning Outcomes	14
D. Evaluation of the Program	15
IV. Expected Outcomes of the Review Process	15
V. Follow-Up Procedures	18
Appendix A: Sample Schedule	20

## Self-Study Document Checklist

- \_\_\_\_\_ University Mission Statement and Strategic Plan
- \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Unit Mission Statement
- \_\_\_\_\_ College Strategic Plan
- \_\_\_\_\_ Data from Institutional Research and Its Analysis
- \_\_\_\_\_ Data Generated by the Academic Unit and Its Analysis
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty CVs, streamlined versions
- \_\_\_\_\_ Select Committee Minutes
- \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewers' Report from Last Review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Action Plan from Last Review
- \_\_\_\_\_ All Annual Reports since Last Review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins
- \_\_\_\_\_ University Program Review Guidelines
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student Handbooks
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty Handbook and Promotion Criteria

**UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW:  
Introduction, Administrative Definitions and Procedures, Self Study Measures,  
Expected Outcomes, and Follow-up Procedures**

**I. INTRODUCTION and PURPOSE:**

Marquette University has had a review process in place since 1972 that mandated separate internal and external reviews. These reviews have helped shape departmental planning and have given voice to departments as they take stock of their resource needs. While this process has been most helpful, it typically required a review every three years and thus has consumed many hours of department time beyond what is reasonable. The Provost's Office desires to consolidate the internal and external reviews into a single review that will presumptively occur every six years. However, in the case of professional programs that are also reviewed by an external accrediting body, the university sponsored program review will usually be tied to the schedule of the accreditation visit. For example, programs that have an accreditation review every five years or eight years, will have their Marquette program review at that same interval. Such reviews will be scheduled in consultation with the academic unit such that use can be made of much of the same information for both reviews and also to allow the academic unit to benefit from the report of the university review when finishing the self study for its accreditation review. In these cases the criteria to be included in self study material will reflect the same criteria as required by the accrediting body. Additional information however, may also be required to assist Marquette in the evaluation of the program.

In the case of new programs, a program review will be conducted after three years to ascertain if original expectations are being met and what, if any, program adjustments should be initiated.

The primary reasons for a continuing program review process are the following:

- First, and above all else, program review is a formative evaluation that assists in the continuous improvement of academic programs and is an important element of the Marquette University assessment system. The cyclical approach insures that continued attention is given to each program. Academic colleagues should use the program review process to examine the effectiveness and ongoing vitality of their programs, and as direction for program improvement.
- Second, program review helps document the currency of the academic curricula. It also provides information on the curricular relationships among disciplines or professions and facilitates possible interdisciplinary program planning among departments.
- Third, deans and the provost may use program review information to evaluate resources.
- Fourth, academic programs can use program review information to promote student learning and enhance its assessment.

- In essence, program review helps identify strong programs that need to be maintained and may help to identify weaker programs that need modification, consolidation, or elimination from the University's academic portfolio.

## II. ADMINISTRATIVE DEFINITIONS AND PROCEDURES:

### **Highlights of Process Steps (not exhaustive):**

1. The Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School (VPRDGS) establishes the schedules for the reviews of the various programs and communicates this information to the relevant academic units.
2. The VPRDGS solicits from the Department Chairperson or Dean the names of potential external reviewers who have no personal connection with the department or its faculty.
3. The VPRDGS examines the background of the potential reviewers, and typically nominates two external candidates to serve as reviewers; the academic unit contacts the nominees to secure their participation and establishes the dates of the review.
4. The academic unit completes the Self Study Document and submits a draft to the VPRDGS for review.
5. The VPRDGS reviews the Self Study materials prior to distribution of a final document to the reviewers by the academic unit. In addition, copies of the final version are sent to the Provost, Vice Provosts, Dean, and Assistant Vice Provost.
6. The reviewers come to campus and have an entrance conference with the Vice Provost for Research, the Assistant Vice Provost for Graduate Programs, and the Dean of the Academic College, during which questions of concern are stated.
7. The review team spends two days meeting with the chairperson, faculty members, library representative, and students of the program. When necessary, the review team may request to meet with other members of the university community.
8. At the end of the second day, an exit conference is held among the reviewers, the Vice Provosts, the Assistant Vice Provost for Graduate Programs, the Academic Dean, and the Provost, to discuss initial findings.
9. Within 45 days, the reviewers submit to the VPRDGS a formal report that addresses the undergraduate and graduate elements of the program. Where differences between the reviewers' opinions exist, separate reports may be written.
10. The VPRDGS makes the report available to the academic unit, giving it an opportunity to respond to and clear up any inaccuracies or misperceptions.
11. The Joint Subcommittee for Academic Program Review scrutinizes both the reviewers' report and the department response and provides a written independent perspective that is the third document used in the following discussions.
12. The Vice Provosts, the Academic Dean, and the Chairperson meet with the Provost to discuss the recommendations. The Provost will prepare recommendations for the unit and assign the reviewed unit to write an action plan to address those agreed upon recommendations. At this point in time, resources to carry out the action plan are discussed.
13. The action plan is submitted to the Provost for approval or revision.
14. Upon approval, the recommendations in the reviewers' report and the action plan are reported to the Academic Senate.
15. Progress on the action plan is reported to the Provost on a yearly basis as part of the Dean's annual report. This is also provided to the Joint Subcommittee.

**Program Definition:** academic programs are defined as the composite of academic and curricular requirements necessary to earn a degree or certificate awarded by Marquette University. For the program review process, a program is defined as any combination of courses leading to the designation of a major, certificate, master's, or doctoral degree offered by an academic unit. This program definition may also include interdisciplinary programs that involve faculty from multiple departments or programs across colleges/schools.

**Program Mix:** the mix of program levels (differing combinations of undergraduate, master's, doctoral, or certificate programs) should be addressed in the self study. Separate sections for each program may be needed but integration of the programs should also be addressed.

**Organizational Dimensions:** A single academic department will be the most common unit for program reviews. However, in some cases the college will be the organizational unit under which program evaluation occurs. If there are different undergraduate majors or graduate specializations within the academic unit, the evaluation should address each of those programs rather than just focus on the academic unit. The review of the programs should occur concurrently but not combined as if they make up a single academic program. Where a large number of specializations occur within an academic unit, additional members may need to be appointed to the review team. Additionally, interdisciplinary programs that involve more than one department or college should be reviewed as a combined unit. It is expected that the self study and the review will encompass all levels (undergraduate, certificate, and graduate).

**The Self Study:** Each academic unit must produce a self study document based upon the recommendations in this guide. It is the purpose of the self study to engage the faculty in addressing information in four areas. First, program profile information must be reported. This information will come primarily from centralized institutional data that will be provided, in advance, to the academic unit for its review and incorporation. Some information however will have to be gleaned from unit records and from other sources. Second, an academic unit must provide a faculty and support personnel profile. Third, a unit must indicate progress made in documenting student learning outcomes. Finally, a unit must report on program evaluative measures including progress on the recommendations made in the last program review and its action plan, progress towards its role in the college's strategic plan, and its own evaluation of the program. Detailed information to be included under these categories can be found in section III.

**Program Review Initiation, Schedules, and Costs:** The academic vice provosts in consultation with the academic deans and their respective chairs, will determine when academic units will undergo formal program reviews. The VPRDGS will notify academic units scheduled for review well in advance of the target review period. Usually, five units are reviewed each year, two during the fall semester (October and November) and three in the spring semester (February, March and April). A typical program review cycle will require a program to receive a review every six years. In situations where outside accreditation is also required, the university program review will typically be scheduled to take place just prior to the accreditation visit. This will serve as a formative review that will identify any deficiencies or changes that need to be made to insure continuous improvement. The VPRDGS will work with the academic units to identify external evaluators to participate in the review. Academic units will make all arrangements for the visit, but the office of the provost will pay all expenses. External reviewers are typically paid \$750/day honorarium plus expenses. The total honorarium is paid upon receipt of the review report.

**Composition of Review Teams and Timetable:** The review-team selection process should begin early and normally be finalized several months in advance of the actual review dates. The reviews will consume two days, usually following a Monday-Tuesday or Thursday-Friday pattern. In situations where a College is the academic unit, a longer period of time may be necessary for the review. The academic unit should identify a pool of 8-12 potential external reviewers. These names should be forwarded to the VPRDGS along with appropriate curriculum vitae data or the complete vitae if available. Most important is a clear indication of degrees held, dates received, awarding institutions, major accomplishments, specialty areas, and special relationships with this unit, if any. The individuals named in the pool should be senior, distinguished scholars with recognizable reputations in teaching, research and publication. In the past, many have had considerable administrative experience, although this is not obligatory. In some disciplines it may be useful to consider deans for the review team. Customarily, the external reviewers are academically based at leading universities in their field. On occasion, a member from business or industry may be a welcome addition. The VPRDGS will notify the academic unit of the names of the individuals selected for the review. The academic unit is responsible for securing the agreement of those individuals to serve as reviewers, setting the dates of the review, and establishing the visit schedule. The unit will also send official confirming letters to the reviewers on behalf of the University. A team is composed of:

Two external peer faculty colleagues selected by the VPRDGS from recommendations by unit faculty and issued through the chair or dean. For reviews that encompass larger academic units or interdisciplinary programs, additional reviewers may be chosen. The graduate dean in consultation with the academic unit will designate the team's chair. One team member shall have experience in departmental administration.

Program reviews will be conducted at a time compatible with the availability of the reviewers and the University and unit administrators.

**Preparing for the Site Visit:** Unit administrators and faculty should share the responsibility for assembling the self-study materials. The self-study should address the various areas listed above and include a separate notebook containing supporting materials. The supporting materials should include faculty curricula vitae (streamlined versions copied on two sides are encouraged), the annual reports since the last review, select committee minutes, reviewers' report and action plan from the last review, the college strategic plan, the *Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins*, and a copy of these guidelines. A draft of the self study materials and all specially prepared background reports should be submitted to the VPRDGS for review. Upon review, the self study should be finalized and forwarded to the reviewers at least one month prior to the site visit. Copies should be forwarded to the Academic Dean, Vice Provosts, Assistant Vice Provost, and the Provost.

The individual academic units are responsible for all local arrangements, e.g., arrivals, departures, accommodations, meals, and site visit schedules. Often a representative from the academic unit will plan to meet a reviewer at the airport and provide transportation to a nearby hotel. External reviewers may wish to arrive in Milwaukee the evening before the first day of the review. Reviewers should be sent detailed instructions about making contact at the airport and transportation arrangements from airport or directions for driving, the hotel's name and address, the fact that Marquette has made reservations in their name and are paying the bill, the hotel's and department's phone numbers. Thus, a missed contact or problem with airplane schedules can be overcome.

A draft of the site-visit schedule should be forwarded to the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School for review.

**The Site Visit :** The actual site visit begins at 8:00 or 9:00 a.m. with an entrance conference, attended by the reviewers, VPRDGS, Assistant Vice Provost, and, if s/he so desires, the Academic Dean of the unit under review. The unit administrator should escort the reviewers to the Office of the VPRDGS for the Entrance Conference scheduled on Day One. The purposes of the Entrance Conference are to (1) describe briefly our institutional character, the MU mission, and the unit's place in the University, (2) answer reviewer questions, (3) discuss the written reports, and (4) handle paperwork for payment of the stipends. The meeting should conclude in 1 ½ hours.

Immediately after the Entrance Conference, the unit administrator should meet with the reviewers to review the visitation schedule and begin an examination of major policies and procedures. Appendix A contains a sample review team schedule. The academic unit is to establish a schedule that best meets its needs. Reviewers are free to modify their schedules as needed. They should have an opportunity to tour physical facilities; meet with all faculty and a representative sample of undergraduate and graduate students. Reviewers may request whatever data or reports they find useful from the department, including aggregate salary data, student program data etc. Personnel files and individual student records are of course confidential and protected under law. Reviewers may also examine appropriate library collections and meet with the Dean of Libraries or his/her designate.

Candor is required in presenting unit strengths and weaknesses. Efficient use of limited time can be made by structuring the review schedule and materials according to the major review areas.

Reviewers should be given time for privacy prior to the Exit Conference, which is the concluding activity of the visit. Scheduled to start between 3:00 and 4:00 p.m. of the second day, the Exit Conference is held in the Office of the Provost. Joining the reviewers and the Provost will be the Vice Provosts, Assistant Vice Provost for Graduate Programs, and the Academic Dean. Its purpose is to provide an initial summary of review findings, clarify questions raised, and suggest possible courses of future action.

### **III. SELF STUDY**

University Program Reviews are to examine every aspect of an academic unit, its faculty and staff, students, facilities, curriculum, resources, policies and procedures, on- and off-campus activities, avenues for student development, and the unit's role in the life of the University and service to the local and larger community, beginning with its efforts to recruit students, continuing with their graduation and following them as alumni, and including all that goes toward providing an excellent education.

The self-study document consists of several parts, all of which serve to enlighten and inform the review team whose ultimate goal is to provide a written critical evaluation of the unit and its endeavors, and to include recommendations for improvement, growth, and development.

The unit's Self Study Document must include, for each of its programs, all the required profile data described below, and may address any or all of the optional factors. These guidelines seek to be comprehensive, and so some items may not pertain to all units, whereas some units may have to interpret terminology appropriately for their situations. When possible, information about the mandatory factors should be reported for the preceding five years including fall, spring, and summer sessions. Certainly the careful deliberation, compilation, and reporting of the requested program factors will require significant collaborative work by many colleagues. As part of this effort, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will provide a year by year array of data upon which the academic unit will reflect and provide comment about trends over the five – or several - year period.

The optional factors as indicated below may be included at the discretion of unit faculty, department chairs, or deans if such factors clearly help identify quality of the program.

### **Section A: PROGRAM PROFILE INFORMATION:**

In this section of the report, you will reflect and comment on the student-related data.

In the following, **AU** means information is generated/provided by the academic unit. **IR** means information that is to be included in the document but that is provided by Institutional Research. The unit is to reflect and comment on this information in narrative form, but should also correct or complement it where unit records substantiate differences or omissions.

- 1. Relationship of each Program to the Mission and Strategic Goals of the University: (AU)** Describe the congruence of the mission of each program with that of the University. Describe how the academic unit contributes to the mission and strategic goals (e.g. transformative education, graduate education, research, student learning, globalization, diversity, human resources, and financial resources). Also highlight the intellectual contribution that the unit makes to the University, including special lecture programs or series, hosting conferences, sponsoring outside speakers on broad issues, and other factors pertinent to the mission of the university.
  
- 2a Program Purpose: (AU)** Describe the purpose of each program. Include a statement of the objectives of the program (the program's broad and general goals). List the program's desired outcomes (specific, measurable results that the program seeks to achieve in order to meet its objectives). Finally, define the program's intellectual place within the discipline.
  
- 2b Core Curriculum:(AU)** Describe the courses that each program contributes, if any, to the University Core of Common Studies. This information pertains only to undergraduate programs.
  
- 3. Students within the Program: (IR and AU)** Identify the number of students within each program. **(IR)** List the number of part-time students and full-time students. For undergraduates, this will be based on enrolled declared majors. For graduate students, this will include enrolled degree and certificate seeking students. Graduate part-time data is presented under Marquette's definition, less than seven credits, and also under federal standards. **(AU)** Indicate the percentage of graduate students who are receiving

financial aid through assistantships. Provide a narrative that elaborates upon the unit's efforts to recruit students and retain them, that describes orientation and advisement activities, and identifies any unit activities, such as curriculum committee, that engage students in the business of the unit, and student organizations fostered by the unit. Include copies of student handbooks.

- 4. Demand for Graduates: (AU)** Include an analysis of the external market factors that foster a program's need or support its growth and enhancement. The self study should provide a record of graduates' employment over the last five years or schools they have attended for advanced study. It is recognized that placement statistics may be more relevant for graduate-degree recipients than for undergraduate-degree recipients.
- 5. Number of Applicants: (IR)** The total number of undergraduate applicants that **IR** can provide will be totals for the college, hence may not be useful to a particular program. **IR** can provide with confidence the total number of graduate applicants to the program. The numbers of students who apply for program admission (and the comparative qualifications of the applicant pool versus the admitted pool) are factors for consideration in all program self studies. Applicant numbers (including those for incoming undergraduate transfer students and graduate students) should be considered over at least the prior five-year time period. Where known, information on unmet demand (qualified students' desire to matriculate in a program to which they cannot gain admission and/or class seats after program admission due to program constraints) should be noted in the department's academic self study.
- 6. Selectivity Rates: (IR)** **IR** will provide an undergraduate selectivity rate = the number of students admitted divided by the number of applicants to the college, and a graduate selectivity rate = the number of students admitted divided by the number of applicants, and will provide the numbers admitted.
- 7. Yield Rates: (IR)** **IR** will provide an undergraduate yield rate = number of students enrolled in the college divided by the number of admitted students, and a graduate yield rate = number of students enrolled in a program divided by the number of admitted students, and will provide the numbers enrolled.
- 8. Enrolled Student Standard Test Scores: (IR)** Among measures of program quality are the admission criteria and student credentials of those matriculating or recruited into programs. Standard measures include scores on the Verbal (V), the Quantitative (Q), and Analytical Writing (AW) sections of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) or the Verbal (V) and Quantitative (Q) scores for the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT), scores for the Law School Admission Test (LSAT), or scores for the Dental Admissions Test (DAT). Further, student scores on relevant subject tests required for program admission also are an index to program quality. To obtain a stable measure, figures for the last five years can be averaged although this is not universally regarded as a reliable measure of program quality. Transcripts and GPA's of prior academic work may also help identify the program quality of program applicants. Lastly, comparable SAT/ACT data for undergraduate programs will help identify the quality of admitted undergraduate students. Higher scores may indicate greater program quality. **IR** will produce a report of those various scores for the currently available data of the past several years.

- 9. High School Percentile: (IR)** IR will report the average high school percentile rank of all enrolled undergraduates with declared major.
- 10. Retention Rates: (IR)** The attrition rate and the timing of such attrition within programs (during undergraduate or graduate degree progression, after comprehensives, or during dissertation work) may indicate programs in difficulty. Program retention rates for undergraduate students are determined after student admission to a recognized major and does not include attrition during the "pre" curricular programs for undergraduate majors. IR will report the number of enrolled undergraduates with declared majors that remain in the program from one fall to the next fall, and similarly of the number of graduate students that remain in the program from one fall to the next. In both cases, those who graduate are excluded.
- 11. Completion Rates: (IR and AU)** Time-to-degree student completion rates within programs at the undergraduate, certificate, master's, and doctoral levels should be established for students who persist within programs. IR will provide reports: for undergraduates – total number of bachelor's degrees and percent of those received in 4 years or less, 5 years or less, and 6 years or less; for certificates – total number of certificates and percent of those received in 2 years or less, 3 years or less, and 4 years or less; for master's – total number of master's degrees and percent of those received in 2 years or less, 3 years or less, and 4 years or less; for doctorates – of those entering for the PhD the total number of doctorates and percent of those received in 6 years or less, 7 years or less, and 8 years or less. For doctoral graduates, the AU will provide the student pass/fail rates on qualifying exams for each doctoral program.
- 12. Prerequisite Physical Space and Facilities: (AU)** This factor is a summary statement about physical space and/or facilities that are necessary for the program alterations or enhancements that may have been proposed in the department's previous action plan. While not exhaustive, this synopsis should indicate what physical space constraints currently limit the program's quality, student learning outcomes, and research accomplishments of the program. Fundamentally, this factor is a judgment about additional physical space, as well as any major facility improvements, that are essential to the department's academic program advancement.
- 13. Curriculum Structure and Changes: (AU)** Explain the curricular structure of each program. Indicate both the required courses and the electives. Provide an evaluative summary of substantial changes made to the intellectual content, the organization of courses (including the required number of credit hours) or the instructional sequence of the curriculum in the academic program during the previous five-year period. Further, any substantive changes in the admission or graduation requirements for students should be noted.
- 14. Teaching Course Loads: (AU)** Provide a list of all courses that have a class structure and that are taught by regular faculty.
- 15. Student Engagement, Bachelor's: (AU)** The AU provides the proportion of undergraduate students who annually engage in academic research and/or applied scholarship. Examples of undergraduate students engaged in academic research or applied scholarship could include recitals and artistic performances, survey research, targeted interviewing, or professional practice and clinical activities.

- 16. Graduate Teaching: (AU)** The **AU** provides a list of all faculty who teach graduate courses.
- 17. Student Engagement, Master's: (AU)** The **AU** will provide the proportion of master's students who annually engage in academic research and/or applied scholarship and point out noteworthy contributions to the discipline.
- 18. Student Engagement, Doctoral: (AU)** The **AU** will provide the number of doctoral students who annually engage in academic research and/or applied scholarship and point out noteworthy contributions to the discipline.
- 19. Class Size: (IR)** **IR** will provide a distribution of class size by course level (lower level undergraduate, upper level undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional – Dental, Law, PHAS, PHTH) for several years. The number of classes will be given for class sizes of 2-9 students, 10-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-99, and 100+. Total number of classes is also provided.
- 20. Funded Activities and Sponsored Research: (AU)** The **AU** can obtain data from the ORSP web page, under ORSP Reports on Awards and Applications. This program measure reports the total annual dollar value of all research grants (and the source of funds) acquired by faculty, staff, and students within an academic unit over the most recent five years. Broadly defined, research grants and contracts awarded to the institution in such categories as research, instruction, demonstration, and training grants are all included. Interdisciplinary funded research grants shall be proportioned between departments on the basis of faculty time and effort in project involvement. The higher the number of faculty with grants, the greater is the sponsored research activity. Further, higher dollar amounts per grant typically indicate greater resources available to the program and student learning activities.
- 21. Publishing Recognition Activities: (AU)** This measure reflects the breadth of annual scholarly publication by tenure-track faculty. Publications are narrowly defined as scholarly books, edited scholarly volumes, book chapters in edited scholarly volumes, and articles published in refereed journals. Individual departments may propose, as part of this technical factor, an interpretation of publication quality. For example, publication quality may be indicated by the relevant citation index, for example, the *Science Citation Index Expanded*, the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, the *Arts & Humanities Citation Index*, the *Philosopher's Index*, or the *Electronic Journals Indexes*. Moreover, the department may establish a rationale for different, variable categories of faculty scholarship in a given academic unit.
- 22. Success of Graduates: (IR and AU)** **IR** will provide a list of the students who have graduated during the last five years, including degree received and year. For graduate students, the **AU** provides the title of their thesis, essay, or dissertation, and major professor. While it may be difficult to provide for bachelor's recipients, where feasible note the graduates' positions following graduation or graduate programs attended. Especially for graduate students, note whether or not they are working in proximity of the field of study in their first position. Also, indicate the manners by which you maintain communication with the alumni.

**23. Equipment Inventory and Needs: (AU)** The AU should provide an inventory of specialized instructional or research equipment used in programs and explain how instructional and research programs are impacted by this inventory. Further, each department may decide to provide a brief description and rationale for a limited number of additional pieces of equipment and explain their potential impact on teaching, student learning, and/or research endeavors of the unit.

**24. Library Resources:** The Library staff will provide a description of library holdings and an assessment of their adequacy in supporting the academic programs in the academic unit. This factor should include consideration of the need for more specialized resources that are pertinent to the discipline(s) knowledge base and the unit's instructional and research needs.

**25. External Success Measures: (AU)** Any external annual measures of program success may be included and shall be considered by review teams. Examples of these include ongoing prestigious Graduate School placements, undergraduate student awards from national or regional competitions, nationally recognized fellowships, casting in a major theatrical or film production, professional licensure rates, or any other external confirmation of program merit and the learning or educational successes of its students. Examples of faculty measures include exchange professorships, activities by invitation, such as lectures, presentations, written work, grant reviewing, conference organization, Fulbright, Woodrow Wilson, Mellon and other awards, or election such as to Fellow of the American Physical Society.

**26. Endowed Chairs, Teaching Excellence Awards, Distinguished Faculty Awards, and Other Excellence Awards: (AU)** A measurement of faculty quality in a department is the number of colleagues who have received this institution's most prestigious internal awards: Endowed Chairs, Haggerty Awardees, Raynor and Gettel Awardees, Way-Klingler Awardees, and other awards. These figures should be compared to the number of tenure track faculty within the program.

**27. Number of Graduate Assistantships: (AU)** List the number of graduate assistants. Graduate assistants are full time graduate students who serve the university by assisting with teaching or research activities.

### OPTIONAL EVALUATION FACTORS

**28. NRC Ratings or Other Widely Accepted External Ratings: (AU)** NRC graduate program ratings are published by the National Research Council, which every ten years assembles panels of scholars to rate the quality of certain graduate programs in the United States and Canada. Depending on the discipline, the number of departments rated can be as few as half or all that offer the Ph.D. at an institution. This reputational rating of the "scholarly quality of program faculty" is made on a 6-point scale, with 5 defined as "distinguished" and 0 defined as "not sufficient for doctoral education." If available for a department offering doctoral degrees, this information may be included in the self study document. Other types of major external ratings of academic programs may be presented as measures of program quality.

**29. Humanities and Creative Recognition Activities: (AU)** This measure reflects the annual breadth of creative arts and humanities participation by tenure-track faculty. Such activities are defined as writing, creative readings and oral history, directing, acting, designing, technical direction, film and television production, choreography, juried exhibitions, musical composition, and musical performance. Higher figures indicate greater participation by the academic unit's faculty.

### **Section B: FACULTY AND SUPPORT PROFILE:**

A listing of personnel resources will provide reviewers with a picture of how effectively available resources are aligned with academic goals. It will provide the reviewers with a foundation for evaluating the program production data reported by the academic units.

- 1. Number of Regular Faculty: (IR and AU)** IR will provide data for several years on number of Regular Faculty (tenured and tenure-track faculty) by rank: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. These are individuals who devote the major and substantial portion of their professional work to teaching and research or administration and are normally full time. The **AU** provides the number of regular faculty who are tenured.
- 2. Number of Participating Faculty: (IR and AU)** IR will provide the number of participating faculty. Participating faculty are officers of instruction who assist the University in teaching and research in varying degrees. The appointment may be full-time or part-time. Participating faculty are not on a tenure track and are not entitled to continued reappointment. The **AU** should list the number of adjunct, clinical, research and other faculty within the academic unit and note whether they are full time or part time.
- 3. Statistics on Faculty Gender, Ethnicity, and Racial Composition: (IR)** IR will provide data for several years on total headcount, and female, African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian/Pacific Islander as percent of total. Diversity among faculty is an important goal at Marquette University. Provide a statistical breakdown of faculty in the academic unit based upon gender, ethnicity, and race.
- 4. Number of New and Retiring Faculty: (AU)** Changes in faculty have a profound affect upon the academic program. Indicate the number of new faculty hired within the past five years and their respective areas of expertise. Indicate the number of anticipated faculty retirements in the next five years.
- 5. Average Thesis and Dissertation Chairing Load per Faculty: (AU)** Responsibility for the direction of theses and dissertations requires an enormous investment of time and energy. Provide the average number of theses and the average number of dissertations per regular faculty member within the program. Note how many, if any, do not serve in this capacity.
- 6. Faculty to Graduate Ratio: (IR and AU)** IR will provide the number of graduates per regular faculty member. **AU** provides the faculty to student ratios for each of the programs being reviewed.

- 7. Number of Support Staff: (AU)** Indicate the number of support staff associated with the academic unit and their titles and functions.
- 8. Number of Postdoctoral Fellows and other Research Personnel: (AU)** List the number of Postdoctoral Fellows and other non-faculty research personnel during the past five years. A Postdoctoral Fellow is a person who has earned the doctorate (or its foreign equivalent) or the appropriate legal, medical, or dental degree but who is not an applicant or candidate for a degree in the University. Postdoctoral Fellows shall engage in research or teaching under the direction of a department of this University.
- 9. Faculty Development: (AU)** Explain the unit's process of faculty development and its promotion and tenure criteria. Include its faculty handbook.

### **Section C: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Continuous student learning assessment is needed to help insure an effective academic program. Due to its yearly measurement it is formative in nature by suggesting program adjustments to better accomplish learning goals. It focuses on outputs rather than inputs and is based upon internal faculty expectations. All of the following is to be provided by the AU.

- 1. Historical Data:** Historical data (either qualitative or quantitative) with an evaluative summary must be presented on student learning outcomes (composite knowledge, skills, activities profiles) for five years (if available). The assessment data provided should be appropriate for program graduates based upon the academic unit's program and/or student assessment plan. The most recent assessment report on student learning outcomes must be included.
- 2. Current Assessment Plan:**
  - a. **Outcomes:** For each program include the student learning outcomes that are expected by faculty.
  - b. **Assessment Measures Utilized:** Indicate the various measures that are used to determine if students have attained the knowledge and skills desired within the discipline. These may be standardized instruments, specially developed measures, portfolios, and other approaches.
  - c. **Target Population:** In some cases it may be possible to sample the total population of students within a program. In other cases the unit may decide to select a random stratified sample of students who represent the population at large. Each program within an academic unit will have its own population of students to be tested.
  - d. **Frequency of Administration:** While assessment measures are episodic in their administration, some are given more frequently than others. Define the frequency of each measurement.

- e. **Individuals Responsible:** Indicate those individuals responsible for administering the assessment instrument and those responsible for analyzing the results. Identify the process used to determine how this information will be used.
3. **Evidence of Impact:** Evidence should be provided to document how student-learning outcomes have directly changed programs or affected the academic unit's decisions about its academic programs.
  4. **Anticipated Future Changes to Assessment:** The actions currently being considered to improve student learning should be identified as well as the strengths and barriers to improving student learning.
  5. **Impact of Previous Program Review on Assessment Process:** Elaborate on the changes made pursuant to the recommendations of the previous program review.

#### **Section D: EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM**

The objective of this section of the program review is to describe the current status of the program and identify its strengths and weaknesses so that reviewers can recommend changes that can be phased in to improve the program. Each year's progress towards meeting recommendations from past reviews is required. At the time of the current program review it is incumbent upon the program to summarize the progress that has been made in regard to any previous action plans and toward its college's strategic plan.

1. **Previous Reports:** Include the previous reports that were submitted each year. Also include an overall summary describing the current status of the program in relation to the action plan that had been developed to meet these recommendations.
2. **Current Strengths and Weaknesses:** Describe the current strengths and weaknesses of the program from the perspective of the academic unit.
3. **Free Commentary:** The unit should identify potential future directions for the program. This may include new courses, new equipment or facilities, new academic programs, additional faculty or elimination of any of these items. The academic unit may also add any additional material not previously entered into the record which will give the reviewers insight into the program.

#### **IV. EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS:**

**The Reviewers' Report:** The outcome of the academic program review process should be a general assessment of program quality with a well-designed, agreed-upon plan for phased improvements by the faculty, department chair, deans, and provost. Reviewers are normally expected to submit a signed copy of a 12-20 page written report. It should be submitted to the VPRDGS within 45 days of the site visit. The report will be made available to the faculty of the unit. The reviewers may, if they see a compelling reason to do so, send a confidential addendum to the central administration, although this is not normally expected. The report

format is flexible. However, the reviewers are asked at a minimum to address the topics listed in the following sections below. The reviewers are asked to address both undergraduate and graduate program issues where appropriate.

**FOR EACH PROGRAM (Undergraduate; Graduate: Certificate, Masters, Doctoral)**  
**PLEASE INDICATE:**

**1. Program:**

- a. To what extent do the educational goals of the program advance the University's mission and the University's strategic plan?
- b. To what extent are the stated goals of the program being achieved?
- c. How well do the stated goals reflect national and international trends in similar programs?
- d. Is the program advancing the state of the discipline or profession?

**2. Curriculum:**

- a. In what ways does the curriculum reflect current regional and national needs and the discipline's standards?
- b. Does the structure of the curriculum support the depth and breadth of student learning generally available in programs in this discipline?
- c. To what extent are the organizing principles and coherence of the program evident to students and faculty members?
- d. Does the degree have its own academic integrity in terms of credit hours and required courses.
- e. Are the instructional strategies appropriate for the discipline and effective for student learning?
- f. Are the program policies and practices appropriate in respect to student admission and retention requirements and student assessment and evaluation methods?
- g. Is the curriculum in need of revisions or adjustments? If so, identify those needs.

**3. Students:**

- a. Do students understand the program expectations and the means of achieving them?

- b. Do program graduate assistantships reflect the norms for programs of this size and reputation in terms of numbers and utilization?
- c. Considering national trends and the nature of this unit's programs, are recruitment prospects adequate to maintain program(s) in the future?
- d. What is the quality of student orientation, guidance and academic/career advisement?
- e. To what extent do students develop a sense of belonging and of ownership?

**4. Faculty:** To what extent

- a. Are the numbers and areas of expertise of the faculty comparable to those in similar programs and appropriate to meet the goals of the unit and the University?
- b. Are faculty expectations for teaching, research and service comparable to those in similar programs?
- c. Do faculty meet the normal expectations for scholarly activity in a program of this size and stated goals?
- d. Are faculty publication records in refereed journals or equivalent performance norms for the unit reflective of national norms and expectations?
- e. Does the faculty bring in sufficient extramural support in comparison to similar departments?
- f. Does the faculty regularly engage in professional development to maintain subject matter expertise and improve teaching and research skills? Are the unit faculty development activities conducive to the sustenance of a robust and dynamic faculty?

**5. Support Facilities:** To what extent

- a. Are support facilities, e.g., library collections, computing resources, media services, and the like, sufficient for student and faculty needs?
- b. Is the physical environment satisfactory (classrooms, laboratories, office space, etc.)?
- c. Is there adequate secretarial, curatorial, and technical assistance within the unit?
- d. Does the unit possess and adequately use equipment and instruments needed to support student learning and faculty work?

**6. General Assessment and Recommendations:**

- a. Please list the program strengths.
  - b. Please provide a summary list of program challenges and weaknesses along with actions and recommendations to effect improvement.
  - c. Summarize findings, deduced from conversations with students, about achievement of selected learning outcomes.
  - d. Report on use of student learning assessment information by the program.
  - e. Discuss the degree to which the unit succeeded in effectively addressing the recommendations of the last program review.
  - f. Where available, discuss the degree to which the unit succeeded in meeting the goals within its college's strategic plan.
7. **Free Commentary:** Please indicate any other observations.

## **V. FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES**

**Distribution:** Once the report is received by the VPRDGS, it will be distributed to the Department Chairperson, the College Dean, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs, and the Provost. In a timely manner, the unit administrator should disseminate the report appropriately among the faculty members in the unit. Consistent with the purpose of using the program review as one mechanism for self-improvement, certain follow-up actions are required.

**Departmental Response:**

The academic unit administration should promote discussion of the report among the faculty and encourage faculty to contribute their reactions, comments, and suggestions regarding the report. These discussions and feedback should culminate in a document that also bears appropriate committee and faculty scrutiny. The overall process employed must be described in that document. The Department in response to report recommendations should identify any inaccuracies or misperceptions and also clearly indicate where and why a recommended action is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate. The department or academic unit should offer its own ranking of recommendations. This response should be in writing.

**Joint UBGs/UBUS Subcommittee Review:**

This subcommittee, elected each year from the tenured membership of the UBGs and UBUS, will provide a written independent perspective on the reviewed unit based on its scrutiny of the reviewers' report and the department/unit response. Its document will be the third datum, along with the reviewers' report and department/unit response, for guiding the discussion among Provost, Vice Provosts, Dean, and Chair toward the development of an action plan.

**Meeting to Discuss Reviewer's Recommendations and Departmental Response:**

**Development of an Action Plan:** Discussions of the Vice Provosts, Academic Dean, and Chairperson with the Provost should lead to recommendations and guidelines for the

formulation of an action plan. The action plan must be realistic within the confines of the resources available. It is expected that many of the recommendations will not require additional resources. Where new resources are required, they must be prioritized so that the University can place its resources where the need is greatest and will have the most impact. The action plan is to be written by the unit and its Academic Dean and submitted to the Provost. The action plan should address specific objectives and methods to be implemented during the six year period in response to recommendations endorsed by the Provost and Academic Dean.

**The Provost and Academic Dean meet to discuss the Action Plan:** Once completed, the action plan is communicated to the Provost and the Vice Provosts, and to the UBGs and UBUS through the Joint Subcommittee. At this point a meeting occurs between the Provost, Vice Provosts, and the Academic Dean where the proposed Action Plan is discussed. Together, the Dean and Provost will identify steps that must be taken, and any resources that need to be considered.

**Report to the Academic Senate:** Upon approval of the action plan by the Provost, a brief summary of the University Program Review and its action plan will be presented to the Academic Senate by the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. It will list the strengths and weaknesses of the program along with the steps that have been identified in the action plan.

**Continued Reporting Structure:** Each year the Academic Dean will, in the annual report, indicate to the Provost the progress made in meeting the requirements of the action plan. The UBGs and UBUS will also receive that information through the Joint Subcommittee.

---

**Nothing in these guidelines is intended or shall be construed to alter the basic governance structure of the University, including the essential fact that program review is a responsibility of the Provost's Office that has been delegated to the Vice Provost for Research.**

---

The University wishes to thank the Council of Graduate Schools, North Carolina State University and Western Michigan University for many of the concepts and procedures printed in this document

October, 2007, Program Review Plan

## APPENDIX A

### Sample Review Team Schedule

DAY/DATE	TIME	TOPIC	PERSONNEL	LOCATION
<b>DAY 1</b>	8:00 am	Pick up from hotel	Department Representative	Hotel
	8:30 am	Entrance Conference	Review Team, V. Provost for Research, Asst V. Provost, Dean of College	Grad School HH 316
	10:00 am	Meet with Department Chair	Review Team, Chair	Department
	10:45 am	Meet with Faculty (subset)	Review Team, Faculty	Department
	12:00 pm	Lunch	Review Team and...	
	1:00 pm	Tour instructional facilities/labs	Review Team and...	Department
	2:00 pm	Meet with Faculty (subset)	Review Team, Faculty	Department
	3:00 pm	Meet with students (subset)	Review team, Students	Department
	4:00 pm	Tour research/ Outreach/ clinical facilities	Review team and ....	Department
	5:30 pm	Hotel drop off	Department Representative	Hotel
	6:00 pm	Dinner	Review Team	

---

<b>DAY 2</b>	7:45 am	Hotel pick-up	Department representative	Hotel
	8:00 am	Meet with outside parties	Review team and ....	Location
	10:00 am	Meet with faculty (subset)	Review team and Faculty	Department
	11:00 am	Meet with students (subset)	Review team and Students	Department
	12:00 pm	Lunch	Review team and ....	
	1:00 pm	Meet with Library staff	Review team and ....	Raynor Library
	1:45 pm	Tour support/ administrative facilities	Review team and ....	Department
	2:15 pm	Meet with support/ administrative staff	Review team and ....	Department
	2:45 pm	Meet with Department Chair	Review team and Chair	Department
	3:00 pm	Executive session	Review team	Department
	4:00 pm	Exit Conference	Review team, Provost, Dean of College, V. Provost for Research, Asst. V. Provost V. Provost for Undergrad	Provost's Office, O'Hara Hall 107
	5:15 PM	Transportation to Airport	Department representative	

Notes:

1. This is a generic template which should be adapted appropriately. The actual schedule should ensure that the reviewers touch all bases.
2. Meals can be used for discussions with the reviewers. Reviewers may wish to have dinner privately.
3. Interview arrangements of the faculty should ensure that all faculty members meet with the reviewers; appropriate subsets could be all untenured faculty, all senior faculty, all faculty within a specialization, all faculty within a specific curriculum, etc.

4. Interview arrangements of students should ensure that students meet with the reviewers in the absence of all faculty and any other University personnel.
5. Outside parties may include faculty or chairs in other departments served by the unit or in collaboration with the unit, or may involve parties not at Marquette.