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# Purpose and process

The review of degree programs is a systematic process with a goal of continuous program improvement. Program review has several purposes:

1. To ensure academic quality and innovation.
2. To document the processes by which the program establishes, implements, and measures its objectives, focusing on student learning outcomes.
3. To review the market and mission relevance of programs and review their contribution to the portfolio of programs offered.
4. To review the relevant departmental/program strategic goals, progress in meeting these goals, and the ways in which the unmet goals can be reached.
5. To educate the rest of the Andrews University community about the contributions of the programs to the university and the Seventh-day Adventist church.

## Governance

The Program Development and Review Committee (PDRC), a sub-committee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, manages the program review process, and reports findings and submits recommendations to the Councils. The PDRC, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and the Office of the Provost will consult with each scheduled program throughout the process.

## Scheduling

Program review is scheduled by the Office of the Provost on a five to seven year cycle. The schedule can be found at [www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/programreview/](http://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/programreview/). Programs will be given approximately a year to complete their self-study. The schedule of program review events for a given program follows the table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program notified to begin review | **Self-study****due** | PDRC assigns panels | Panel reportdue | Chair response | PDRC reviews report | Councils review report | Provost & Dean discuss action steps | Budget, Bulletin & Curriculum changes |
| Apr- Aug, 1 year prior | 2nd Friday of following August | Aug - Sep  | 2nd Friday in January | 2nd Friday of February | Feb - Apr | Mar - May | May - Jul | Aug - Nov |

### Timeline of Program Review Process

## Accredited Programs

Externally accredited programs follow an abbreviated process. The Dean will determine which of the Review Questions have not been covered in the accreditation process, and program faculty will be responsible for answering those questions only. Program faculty may choose to answer other questions if they want to convey additional information to administration. Responses to the Review Questions, as well as the self-study, must be submitted to the Program Development and Review Committee chair within 6 months of the site visit. See Program Review Questions for Accredited Programs at [www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/programreview/](http://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/programreview/).

# Self-Study Instructions

## Criteria

Each program prepares a self-study covering these points in detail:

1. Mission, History, Impact, and Demand for the Program
2. Program Quality: Inputs and processes; program outcomes; evaluative tools and documented results, including success of graduates
3. Financial Analysis: seven-year review of department income and revenue.
4. Strategic Analysis: strategies, progress on strategies, weaknesses, new opportunities, threats, action plans and future needs to reach strategic goals.

## Preparing for the Self-Study

Initially, program faculty should review the program mission statement, goals, and strategic plan, determine comparable programs for benchmarking, collect all the relevant information about the program, and work with the library to assess the adequacy of available library resources for your program.

1. Review mission statement, goals, and strategic plan and update as needed.
2. Select benchmark institutions/programs, and identify potential external reviewers who might serve on the panel.
3. Collect information needed.
4. Department records about the program: curricula, enrollment, retention, quality indicators, faculty publications, results from student and alumni surveys and related data, assessment reports, annual departmental reports.
5. Assessment data, from annual assessment reports, documenting learning outcome achievement and other measures of student success (i.e. graduate placement), and how the department has used assessment results to make decisions.
6. Productivity reports (e.g., credit hour production), from the dean’s office, and enrollment numbers for majors and minors, found on IVue.
7. Curriculum map showing how program outcomes are addressed in the curriculum and where learning outcomes are assessed. If you do not have a curriculum map for your program, schedule an appointment with the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (ext. 6066) for assistance.
8. Financial information: consult with respective dean’s office for income and expenditure data, tuition discounts, and other factors related to actual income.
9. Contact the Dean of Libraries for a Library Evaluation to determine adequacy of library resources for the program. The Library will need to know:
10. The degree requirements, course descriptions, and strategic plan for the program
11. Any specific professional accreditation standards for library support
12. Institutions the department uses as benchmarks for their programs
13. Whether the program (especially new programs) builds on library support for existing programs of the University

Self-study examples may be found at [www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/programreview/](http://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/programreview/).

## Conducting the Self-Study

The department chair and faculty should meet together to discuss the program. Each of the self-study criteria has been broken down into topics. At the beginning of each topic there may be a list of data that could be used to help to answer the question. You may have other data not listed that you should also include. Faculty must answer the Review Questions listed for each topic. “For Discussion” questions are provided to help to frame responses to the Review Questions. The responses to Review Questions and accompanying data constitute the self-study.

# Criterion 1: Mission, History, Impact, and Demand

The program is consistent with and contributes to the achievement of the University’s mission. The program fills a unique niche within Andrews University and/or the world church, serving the needs of a diverse student body as well as its external constituencies. Graduates from the program have a variety of opportunities for advanced training and careers within the field. (*HLC Criterion 1*)

## 1. Mission

The mission statement should describe the program’s primary purpose, or reason for existence. It should align or be in harmony with Andrews University’s mission statement. A good mission statement identifies the stakeholders, describes the program provided, and the uniqueness of that program, differentiating it from related programs, both on campus and at competing institutions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| Mission Statement | Annual Assessment Reports (Weave) |
| Records of mission development and benchmarking | Department |

**Review Question #1**: How does the program contribute to the mission of Andrews University and the Seventh-day Adventist Church?

**For Discussion** (Questions that may aid the discussion of how to formulate a response to the above Review Question): How does the program fulfill the stated mission?

## 2. History

**Review Question #2**: How does the history of the program define the contributions of the program to Andrews University?

**For Discussion**: When and how was the program established? What were the motivations that led to the establishment of the program? What major changes in the program’s curriculum, focus, and/or constituency have occurred since its establishment?

## 3. Impact

**Review Question #3**: How does the program contribute to the academic success of Andrews University?

**For Discussion**: How does this program contribute to the success of programs in other departments? How does this program contribute to the success of other programs in the same department/school? How does the program contribute to the general education curriculum?

## 4. Demand

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| Enrollment data (5 years), majors, minors | IVueOffice of Institutional Effectiveness (ext.3308)  |
| Class size data (major courses, service courses) | Dean’s office, Office of Institutional Effectiveness (ext.3308) |
| Credit hours generated (majors, service courses) | Dean’s office, Office of institutional Effectiveness (ext.3308) |
| Information on supply and demand from government website. | <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/> |
| Employment statistics | Department tracking, graduate or alumni surveysInstitutional data on graduates or alumni from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (ext.3308) |

**Review Question #4**: What is program enrollment and state of demand for graduates of the program?

**For Discussion**: What is the demand for this program globally, nationally, regionally, and/or within the Adventist community? How does the program contribute to other programs in the University? What institutions do we compete with for students in this program? How does this program compare with programs at competing institutions with respect to student enrollment? Is the employment demand for graduates from this program robust? Is enrollment related to anticipated demand for graduates?

#

# Criterion 2: Program Quality

The program should be academically rigorous, requiring a high level of academic achievement appropriate to the degree level, regardless of where or how the program is offered (on-campus or off; face-to-face or via distance, over a full semester or compressed). It engages all students in “collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments” within their field (HLC Criterion 3.B.3.). The program provides students with opportunity to Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, and begin to Change the World. Graduates of the program are well equipped to provide compassionate service in the Seventh-day Adventist Church and the world.

## 1. Inputs and Processes

The program has sufficient physical and human resources to deliver a high quality Christian education. Facilities, equipment, technology and library resources provide the tools needed for students to learn and practice. The department in which the program is offered provides a safe environment for students to develop their faith, learn how to live within a diverse world, and engage in service to others. Faculty are appropriately qualified, and current and active within their profession. They oversee the curriculum, expectations for student performance, and assessment of student learning; and they facilitate learning of all of their students through effective teaching, advising and mentoring. (HLC Criterion 3)

### a. Human & Physical Resources

Faculty must hold credentials that are relevant to what they are teaching, and “at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established.” Faculty teaching in graduate programs should also have a record of research and scholarship appropriate to the discipline. (*Determining Qualified Faculty: Guidelines for institutions and peer reviewers,* HLC, May 2014)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| Lists of faculty credentials and courses taught |  |
| Course Evaluation Data, comparisons between locations and delivery formats | Office of Institutional Effectiveness (ext.3308) |
| List of faculty research, presentations, awards |  |

**Review Question #5**: Describe how the available human and physical resources contribute to a strong program of high quality that mentors students to succeed.

**For Discussion**: How many faculty, staff, and student workers are assigned to the program? What are the degrees/qualifications of the faculty to teach in the discipline (how many have discipline appropriate terminal degrees)? What percentage of instruction is offered by full-time faculty? Is the number of faculty sufficient to mentor students adequately? What are the equipment, facilities, and other resources used by the program? Are there sufficient resources of high enough quality to maintain an excellent program? Where might resources be strengthened and/or reallocated to strengthen the program?

### b. Library Resources

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| Library Evaluation | Dean of Libraries |

**Review Question #6**: Are library holdings adequate for the program, and to what extent are they available and utilized?

**For Discussion**: Are there professional accreditation standards for library support? How do library resources compare at benchmark institutions? Does building library support for your program strengthen others or vice versa? How are library resources used in the curriculum?

### c. Curriculum & Technology

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| *Review bulletin documentation for accuracy* | Academic Records |
| Program Guides and Handbooks |  |
| Curriculum map, showing required courses and sequencing | (For assistance, call the Office of Institutional Effectiveness X3308) |
| Other documents describing the program |  |
| Comparisons with benchmarked programs |  |
| External accreditation reports |  |

**Review Question #7:** How rigorous is the curriculum for the preparation of graduates with skills necessary for a global workplace, who are able to adapt to changing environments and technology within their field? How well does the program engage students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information, and in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work? (Please note if the program is taught online or off-campus)

**For Discussion**: What is the nature of your program’s curriculum? How does it compare with similar or competing programs? What is the scope of the program (its breadth and depth)? Are the curricula current and appropriate for preparing graduates for their careers? How adaptable is the program to anticipated changes in technology and in other areas? Does the program successfully provide for the intellectual, social and spiritual development of students? How does the number of swing and cross-listed courses compare with the number in benchmark institutions, and how is academic rigor maintained at the graduate level?

## 2. Outputs and Outcomes

### a. Outputs

The integrity (dispositions) and skills of graduates make them sought after by prospective employers. Graduates are successful in securing employment and/or further education within their field or educational goal (i.e. medical school, law school, etc.).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| # of Graduates and graduation rates  | Office of Institutional Effectiveness X3308[www.andrews.edu/effectiveness](http://www.andrews.edu/effectiveness) |
| Scholarly research, performances, other contributions of students  |  |

**Review Question #8**: How do the various measures of outputs demonstrate the quality of the program?

**For Discussion**: How are students involved in research with faculty? If your program offers non-professional doctoral degrees, how many students’ dissertations are published and where?

### b. Student Learning Outcomes

Program goals connect the mission statement to the student learning outcomes. Goals should convey the focus and expectations of the program, and give direction for implementation of the mission. The program has clearly stated, meaningful, and measurable learning outcomes. Assessment data is used to inform decision making and improve student learning. (HLC Criteria 3 & 4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| Curriculum Map |  |
| Program Goals & Student Learning Outcomes | Annual Assessment Reports (Weave) |
| Outcomes linked or mapped to University Goals  | Annual Assessment Reports (Weave) |
| Assessment data on achievement of student learning outcomes  | Annual Assessment Reports (Weave) |

**Review Question #9**: How well are students meeting the program’s learning outcomes?

**For Discussion**: How do student learning outcomes compare with benchmark programs? How appropriate are your program’s student learning outcomes to the degree level(s)? Are multiple assessment measures used? Is there external validation of quality? Evaluate the strengths of the processes for assessment of learner outcomes and use of data for program improvement.

### c. Student & Employer Satisfaction

**Review Question #10**: How successful are program graduates in seeking graduate and professional admission? What is the level of satisfaction among students, alumni, and employers of alumni with the program and its outcomes?

**For Discussion**: Do alumni records and placement data give insights into program success?

### d. Program Improvement

**Review Question #11**: How have the above data contributed to decisions for program improvement? What impacts have these evidence-based changes had on student learning and student success?

**For Discussion**: In what innovative ways is the program responding to changes and needs?

# Criterion 3: Financial Analysis

The program is adequately supported by the institution and, in turn, contributes to the health of the university. It is either income generating, contributes largely to the success of other university programs, or plays a key role in supporting the university’s mission in the United States or abroad. (HLC Core Component 5.A.).

## 1. Cost & Income

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Data* | *Source* |
| Standards for contributions to institutional overhead | Dean’s office |
| Cost/Income ratios | Finance office |

**Review Question #12**: What is the relationship between the cost of the program and its income and how has that been changing over time?

**For Discussion**: Does the revenue from tuition, fees, and other sources of income such as entrepreneurial activities associated with the department offering the degree cover the direct costs of the program as well as an appropriate contribution to institutional overhead? Are there capital and other major operating expenses, such as on-going laboratory and research costs? What income has the program generated for itself from external grants and other sources, and what does it receive as a result of overhead or indirect cost recovery for the institution? If the program is offered online or off-campus, how does that contribute to or affect the cost and revenue of the program?

## 2. Overall Financial Health

**Review Question #13**: What is the (financial and other) impact of the program on the University and, based on trends, how is that likely to change in the future? How adequate is University support to maintaining the health of the program?

**For Discussion**: In what other ways (besides financial) does the program contribute to University well-being? What would be the consequences (financial and other) to the University if the program was strengthened or discontinued? What do financial trends indicate regarding the sustained viability of the program?

# Criterion 4: Strategic Analysis

Program faculty have a clear understanding of their program’s strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and capacity for growth and/or prestige, and changes in market or customer base that may threaten the health of the program. They have benchmarked similar programs and have considered changes within the discipline as well as emerging technologies and the global marketplace. Areas for improvement have been identified by a thorough analysis of program objectives, student learning outcomes, and market data. A strategic plan has been developed, in accordance with the strategic goals of the university, which will maintain or bring the program into a position of strength in the coming five years that supports the mission of Andrews University. (HLC Core Component 5.C.)

## 1. Strengths

**Review Question #14**: Describe the strengths of the program.

**For Discussion**: What examples of exemplary performance does the program demonstrate? Consider academic strengths, financial strengths, and the holistic development of student potential. What positive impacts does the program have on the University? What positive impacts does the program have on students?

## 2. Weaknesses

**Review Question #15**: Describe the weaknesses of the program and the plans that are in place to address them.

**For Discussion**: In what areas could the program be improved? Consider weaknesses in academic and financial areas as well as weaknesses in student development.

## 3. Opportunities

**Review Question #16**: Describe the opportunities likely to present themselves to the program in the coming years and the changes and resources necessary to take advantage of them.

**For Discussion**: What are the opportunities for growth or expansion of the program? In what ways might the program need to change to address trends or future opportunities? What external factors will affect the program and demand for its graduates? Can restructuring and/or technological innovations be implemented that will more effectively utilize educational best practice and the newest information technology while containing costs? What is the relationship of the program to emerging trends in distance and asynchronous learning? How might cooperative or collaborative relationships with other programs/institutions contribute to future opportunities, service, and effectiveness? Is this program poised to transform itself in new and different ways in order to meet the needs of twenty-first century learners? What resources would be necessary to take advantage of opportunities?

## 4. Threats

**Review Question #17**: Describe the threats that may negatively impact the program in the coming years and the changes and resources necessary to mitigate them.

**For Discussion**: What are the threats to the continued viability of the program? What external factors might negatively impact the program and demand for its graduates? What threats are there to program quality?

## 5. Strategic Plan

**Review Question #18**: What should be the future direction of your program and what steps and resources are necessary to take your program in that direction? How might changes and trends in technology, student demographics, and enrollment impact this direction?

**For Discussion**: In light of all of the Review Questions you have answered so far, in what direction should the program be moving? Should the program be discontinued, expanded or changed? Should a new program be initiated? What steps are necessary to implement your plans? What resources are necessary?

## 6. Additional Information & Recommendations

**Review Question#19**: Give any additional information that should be included in the self-study. Describe program recommendations.

**For Discussion**: Is there additional information that should be given to reviewers or administration that was not addressed elsewhere?

#

# Panel Review Instructions

## Overview

After the self-study is completed, a five-member panel of peer faculty appointed by the PDRC reviews the self-study and makes recommendations to the PDRC. The review panel consists of four Andrews University faculty members from departments not offering the program under review and one external reviewer. One of the panel members is also a member of the PDRC and appointed to serve as a liaison with the PDRC guiding the panel through the process. The external team member usually teaches in a similar program in another higher education institution. The review panel for externally accredited programs need not include external members because external reviewers are part of the accreditation review process.

The review process usually includes meeting with the dean of the school/college, program director, and/or faculty. When the review panel is satisfied that it has a verified and accurate reading of the state of the program under review, it presents its findings in a report to the PDRC chair, who forwards a copy to the program asking for a response. The report, with the program response is considered the final report.

## Panel Instructions

Instructions for the panel are as follows:

1. Review the program review purposes and self-study criteria.
2. Review program goals, outcomes, assessment results, and the curriculum map as evidence of program rigor.
3. Examine responses and supporting data in the self-study in light of the four criteria.
4. Meet with members of the program faculty and tour its facilities. During this meeting, the panel can ask questions resulting from its review of the self-study. If the panel believes that it needs more information to evaluate the program than is provided by the self-study materials and meeting with the program faculty, the panel should request that information from the program director.
5. Meet with the school dean. During this meeting, the panel can ask question regarding how the program fits within the school mission and other program offerings.
6. Prepare a report including your evaluation of program strengths and weaknesses and your recommendations for the program, according to the framework shown below. The report and recommendations shall be based on verified data/information.

There could be another section of the report that deals with tangential or unverified information presented during the program review process. This section is for the purpose of sharing information that may be instructive to the university administration.

Consensus should be reached on all of the recommendations included in the panel report.

1. Submit the report to the PDRC Chair no later than the second Friday in January. The Chair will forward a copy to the program, asking for a response. The panel report, along with the program’s, response is considered the final report.

## Panel Report Framework

The panel’s report consists of three sections:

1. Evaluation of strengths and weaknesses
2. After reviewing the data and responses to Review Questions under criterion 2, what is your evaluation of the program academic quality and innovation? What information supports this evaluation? (cite Review Question/response numbers or data)
3. After reviewing the data and responses to Review Questions under the four criteria, what is your evaluation of the program’s relevance to the mission of Andrews University, the Church and to the marketplace? What information supports this evaluation?
4. After reviewing the data and responses to Review Questions under criterion 4, what is your evaluation of the strategic plan for the program? What information supports this evaluation?
5. Recommendations
* What are your recommendations for the program?
1. Observations:
* Are there observations (unverified or unverifiable) that the review panel has about the program that may be shared with the university administration? These are observations that are not part of the panel’s recommendations or conclusions but may be insightful and are shared with administration.

## Results

After receiving and reviewing the final report, the PDRC records the report, votes recommendations, and presents the report to the respective council – graduate council and/or undergraduate council. The council records the report, votes on the recommendations, and may append comments to the report. The final report, with any comments from the PDRC or council, is forwarded to the provost and the dean of the college/school responsible for that program. The provost, meets with the dean to discuss the final report and the implementation of recommendations.

Within three months of receiving the final report, the provost and dean submit a joint written response to the PDRC, indicating what actions have been, or will be taken, as a result of the report. The PDRC records this response. Departments/programs shall be responsible for indicating the ongoing work on their own recommendations and those of the review team in annual reports.

## Education of Andrews Family about Program

It is important to the purpose of program review that the Andrews University community be able to learn about the contributions of various university programs to the university and the Seventh-day Adventist church. The program chair/coordinator or dean will be asked to share highlights from the program review process with the faculty in faculty meetings in the year following program review. Current versions of the final reports will be available online or from the Office of Institutional Assessment.