PROGRAM REVIEW OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The Carbondale campus will incorporate information from the reports prepared by the Internal Review Teams and External Review Teams as well as information provided in the Self Study into the review cycle. Guidelines, reporting requirements, and a format for the program review report will be provided to all participants in the review.*

PURPOSE

Program review should provide a snapshot of the current "state of health" of each unit. The review should provide evidence of the progress that the unit has made since the last review and should document the short- and long-range goals of the program. The reviewers' role should be to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program and assess the program's status within the discipline. The review process should provide an opportunity to determine whether the program meets the goals of the institution and then facilitate the establishment of corrective actions necessary to carry out the university's mission. Program review can also provide a basis for documenting and acknowledging excellence in teaching, research, and service by the faculty and staff.

According to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, however, one essential component of program review is the "documentation of student learning outcomes" as well as the "identification of actions for program improvement."** Clearly, for all degree programs, these two components are linked: assessment data are critical to identifying what actions to take to improve teaching and learning; without them, the review process is incomplete. Consequently, all program reviews, where appropriate, must attend to student learning – in the self-study prepared by the faculty, in the reports written by the reviewers, and in the response administrative leaders provide to the self-study and the reports – as required by the IBHE and nearly all accrediting bodies, including the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.

INTERNAL REVIEW TEAMS

The appointment of the Internal Review Team is made from a list of five faculty nominees furnished by the Department or Unit in consultation with the Collegiate Dean. The Director of Assessment and Program Review, in consultation with the Provost, selects two of these nominees for the Team.

---

*Medical school program reviews are coordinated by the Office of the Dean and Provost, SIU School of Medicine. Cooperative programs of the SIUC and SIUSOM are reviewed together by the offices of the SIUC Provost and the SIUSOM Provost. While the names of SIUC committees are utilized in this document, equivalent SIUSOM committees will be used for medical school program reviews. SIUC program reviews are managed by the SIUC Director of Assessment and Program Review. The SIUSOM Assistant Provost for Institutional Planning manages the medical school's program reviews.
**Documentation of student learning outcomes does not apply to research and service units under review

When the two faculty members have agreed to serve as reviewers, the Director of Assessment and Program Review will submit their names to the Faculty Senate for confirmation by the Undergraduate Education Policy Committee. If one or more of the programs under review in a Department or Unit is post-baccalaureate, a third member of the Team is appointed by the Program Review Committee of the Graduate Council.

The complete Internal Review Team then meets with the Director of Assessment and Program Review, Department/Center faculty, students, chair/director, and academic dean before meeting with the External Review Team.

EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAMS

At least two external consultants will assist in the review. The unit undergoing review should select a minimum of five individuals who are respected members of their disciplines. In selecting these nominees, the unit should make every effort to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest. Current or former collaborators, colleagues, mentors, and students of unit, faculty and staff are inappropriate, as are past reviewers of the unit. These names should be submitted to the Director of Assessment and Program Review, who in consultation with the Collegiate Dean and the Provost will make the final decision on the selection of consultants. When two individuals have agreed to serve as reviewers, the Director of Assessment and Program Review will submit their names to the Faculty Senate for approval.

The consultants are brought to the campus for a two-day visit where they will tour supporting facilities (such as offices, classrooms, laboratories and the library) and interview the faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Initial communication with the consultants, including matters such as payment for travel and honoraria, is handled by the Office of Assessment and Program Review.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The principal information sources are the Self Study document, including data on student learning outcomes as appropriate, and personal interviews with university personnel. After meeting with the Director of Assessment and Program Review, the Internal Reviewers will set up meetings with the appropriate administrators, collegiate dean/graduate dean, department chairs, faculty, staff, and undergraduate/graduate students from the department's programs. Meetings with these departmental representatives will be arranged by the units themselves for the External Review Team during their site visit.

REPORTS

Internal Review Team Report: The Internal Review Team will present a brief summary of their review findings to the program Chair/Director, the appropriate Deans, and the External Review Team within two weeks of the external consultants' visit. The Internal Review Team will also compile a report of their

evaluation of the program(s) being reviewed, paying particular attention to student learning in degree programs. This report is to be submitted to the Office of Assessment and Program Review and to the External Review Team within two weeks following the external consultants' visit.

External Consultants' Report: At the conclusion of the site visit, the External Consultants will share an oral summary of their findings to the Internal Review Team and unit/program management. After the site visit, the external consultants prepare, jointly or individually, a written report reflecting their judgment regarding the status of the unit including its administration, faculty strengths, funding, and quality of undergraduate/graduate programs (based in part on assessment data). The reports may include specific recommendations for changes in any aspect of the unit's structure, operation, or programs. These reports are sent to the Office of Assessment and Program Review for distribution to the Chancellor, Provost, Collegiate Dean, Graduate Dean, the Internal Review Team, the Department Chair, and the Program Review Committee of the Graduate Council.

The external consultants are strongly encouraged to submit their report(s) within two weeks of the visit to campus. The Office of Assessment and Program Review will assist the consultants in any way possible to meet the deadline.

Deans' Reports: The Collegiate Dean reviews the Internal Review Team's report, the External Consultants' report, and other pertinent information, and discusses the findings with the Chair/ Director to express their mutual concerns and interests. If a graduate component is under review, the Dean should confer with the Graduate Dean regarding the findings as well. The Dean(s) then develop a report that summarizes the review findings for submission to the Provost. If the Dean and the program faculty differ on the reports, the Department or Unit may send its own response to the Provost.

Provost's Recommendations: The Provost reviews the Dean's report and meets with the Dean(s) to discuss his recommendations. The Provost will prepare a written memorandum to the Dean(s) summarizing recommendations for the program.

OUTCOME OF REVIEWS

Recommendations resulting from the review are implemented by those normally responsible for the delivery of program aspects. The faculty of the department will take into consideration any suggestions for changes in curricular requirements in addition to other relevant matters. The Collegiate Dean may consider changes in personnel assignments or budgeting for the department from within collegiate resources or may request additional resources for program improvement or expansion. The Graduate Dean may either increase or decrease the number of fellowships or take other appropriate actions. The Provost may use program review findings as a basis for establishing New Program Requests for subsequent RAMP submissions. If serious problems are identified, then the program will be reviewed again in a specified time frame, reasonable for the particular conditions

identified in the original review (for example, after three years).

In consultation with the unit Chair/Director, the Dean, and the Provost, the Director of Assessment and Program Review will report on the review process to the Provost and the

Campus-Wide Assessment Committee (CWAC) each year after the review cycle. This report will identify trends evident in the review process, the self-studies, the internal and external reviewers' reports, the Deans' reports, and the Provost's recommendations, especially as they pertain to student learning and program improvement. The CWAC will use the Director's report to monitor and consider changes in the assessment of student learning. And the Provost will use the Director's report, as appropriate, in preparing the annual Performance Report to the SIU President's Office, the SIU Board of Trustees, and the IBHE.

Resolution to Approve 'Assessment and Program Review' Paper

Whereas, SIUC Graduate Council recognizes the importance of quality internal and external reviews;

Whereas, the Assessment Program Review office is charged with the implementation of such reviews;

Whereas, the role of assessment is critically important to ensure that programs maintain quality;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Graduate Council approves the recently updated guidelines (http://assessment.siuc.edu/Program_Review_Overview.pdf) outlining the strategies and requirements for such internal/external reviews.