



MEMORANDUM

PROVOST & VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Voice: 906-635-2211

Fax: 906-635-6671

Email: MWALWORTH@LSSU.EDU

TO: Dr. McLain
FROM: Morrie Walworth
DATE: September 5, 2013
SUBJECT: Program Review

Thank you for voicing your support for program review. As a requirement of the HLC, it's imperative that we prepare for our upcoming 2016-2017 visit in both assessment and program review. I would like to thank Dr. Fiebelkorn, Dr. Gordier, and Dr. Myton for their efforts in drafting this report for your review.

In the drafting of this report, we have tried to focus on program review and not program prioritization. Program review is an academic activity and as such, it is required by the HLC. Furthermore, the HLC expects significant faculty involvement in the process.

At this point, the attached document (plan for Academic Program Review) has been created by the Provost's Council and disseminated to all faculty for comment. I will convene a meeting of all deans and chairs to solicit input and finalize the plan. In its current form, the plan draws upon quantitative information which is then summarized in qualitative narratives.

You will find six required areas (and one optional area) for reporting within the plan. They include:

- 1) program contribution to the LSSU Mission/Vision
- 2) metrics of program productivity
- 3) Internal and external program demand
- 4) Program quality
- 5) Program assessment
- 6) Program opportunity analysis
- 7) Optional (or review of "no-cost" program)

In your request for this plan, you asked that five areas be addressed. I will respond to those five areas in this memo.

- Establish and disseminate schedules for academic program review.
 - We have asked each school to provide a list of 25-30% of its programs for each of the next four years for evaluation each year.
 - The typical review cycle will be four years. We would certainly adjust the review cycle to align with outside accrediting agency schedules in order to increase efficiency. Programs only need to make the request.

- Establish and disseminate common templates for Program Review reporting, including the requirements aligned with HLC criteria and rubrics for the evaluation of the reports.
 - A common template for review has been drafted and disseminated. The template guides the program through qualitative measures, generally based on quantitative data, and results in a narrative for each of the categories.
 - The template incorporates HLC criteria as well as additional information of importance to LSSU.
- Establish Common Data Sets for use in program review and institutional assessment.
 - The Data Analyst has been working on common data sets for review and dissemination. Well over 1000 Discoverer reports have been converted into Argos by the IT staff, and training on Argos is available from the Data Analyst. Data requests will be a topic of discussion at the next dean/chair meeting.
- Develop institutional procedures for reporting and evaluation of the program-level assessment of educational achievement and improvement through the ongoing assessment of student learning.
 - The assessment committee will begin the review of all submitted course and program Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) this year.
 - Review of the SLO will ensure that the outcomes are measurable, the outcomes are consistent with the program and/or course level, programs have assessment plans and curriculum maps, data is being gathered, data is being reviewed, information is being used to improve the program SLO.
 - The committee and Associate Provost have offered to assist departments/schools in the development of SLO.
 - Reporting of all activities will be captured in TracDat.
- Provide institutional evidence of systematic and integrated planning to link processes of assessment, planning, evaluation and budgeting.
 - In order to meet this goal, we will need to utilize the data provided by this first group of 25-30% of the programs, since they will be the only source of information where we can document, institutionally, that we are closing the loop.
 - We expect that information from this year's review will be used to make changes in the 14-15 academic year. Programs will be able to gather information on the effect of those changes and report their findings just before the visit.

We will need to move the process along at a fairly quick pace in the next few months in order to fully meet all the objectives. Meetings of the deans/chairs will focus on the finalization and implementation of a plan that most effectively and efficiently meets the needs of LSSU.

Presidential Directives Report

DRAFT - Academic Program Review

The HLC Criterion for Accreditation 4.A.1 require institutions to have a “**practice of regular program review**” (<http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html>) as one component of our ensuring the quality of our educational programs and the evaluating our effectiveness in achieving our stated student learning outcomes. As the university moves toward compliance with this requirement we are requiring each school to conduct formal reviews of approximately 25% of their degree programs in each of the next four years. Deans may approve alternate schedules that coordinate with external accreditation reviews. A schedule for program reviews within the school is to be submitted to the Dean by the end of the first week of classes during the Fall 2013.

By April 1 of the review year the school will submit a Program Review Report for each scheduled degree program which will address the following numbered criteria. The first cycle of program reviews will be due on April 1, 2014. Note that evaluation criteria and relative weightings are identified for each section, along with the recommended maximum length for each section. Recommended page lengths are flexible as long as the total document does not exceed 10 pages.

The Program Review will address the following criteria:

1. Contribution to LSSU Mission/Vision
2. Metrics of Productivity
3. Internal and External Program Demand
4. Program Quality
5. Program Assessment
6. Opportunity Analysis
7. Optional, including “No cost to LSSU”

a)	PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA & DESIRED REPORT CHARACTERISTICS			
b)	Growth and Investment - Critical that Program Exists. Identified for Enrichment.	Maintenance – Important that Program exists. Continuation at current, or higher, Levels of Support.	Reorganization, Consolidation or Reduction – Desirable not Essential. Continue at decreased support.	Candidate for Phase Out – Not Essential. Review for Possible Discontinuation.
c)	1. Mission/Vision (1 page, 10%) Provide a narrative introduction to the overall School, its programs and history. Review the evidence supporting the essentiality of this program to the institution, and the importance of the program with respect to achieving the LSSU Mission and/or strategic plan/goals. a) Narrative relates program goals to advancing LSSU’s vision, mission and strategic goals.			
d)	Program can demonstrate a direct link to advancing LSSU’s vision, mission and strategic goals.	Program can demonstrate some relation to or support of LSSU’s vision, mission, and strategic goals.	Program has little evidence of link to or advancement of LSSU’s vision, mission or strategic goals.	Program has no relation to LSSU’s vision, mission or strategic goals.
e)	Program is unique in state or region, evidence of two or more significant distinguishing factors identified	Program is aligned with national or state accreditation standards, but lacks evidence defining distinction.	Program is aligned with national or state accreditation standards, no evidence of distinction	Program has not external reference points, narrative does not provide evidence of identifying characteristics or distinction

f)				
g)	<p>2. Productivity (Data for this section will primarily generated via ARGOS, 15%)</p> <p>An analysis and presentation of relevant metrics including, but not limited to, credit hours taught (majors, general education, other service courses), degrees granted, student retention, time-to-degree, number of majors, minors, enrollments (and various metrics per faculty FTE); student faculty ratio; faculty advising within and outside of program; ratio of credit hours offered to majors versus non-majors. Other indices may include operational expenditures compared to comparable institutions; unit efficiency; investment in facilities and equipment; potential economies of scale, proportion of administrative to total costs; self-sustaining and revenue generating activity.</p> <p>a) Narrative provides analysis of metrics that support program continuation, enhancement of institutional support or changes in staffing.</p>			
h)	Analysis of metrics presented supports case for program growth and investment. Evidence of program quality at or above peers and like units at LSSU.	Analysis provides limited evidence, and/or evidence from program quality metrics at average for peers and like units at LSSU.	Analysis lacks evidence, metrics below average for peers and like units at LSSU.	No analysis provided, or evidence from metrics indicate the program is significantly below peers and like units at LSSU.
i)	Program generates more revenue than expense.	Program is revenue neutral – revenue generated generally matches expense.	Program is costly, perhaps inefficient, in its use of resources.	Program is chronically in fiscal trouble (account deficits growing).
j)	Program has favorable operating expense comparison with peers and comparable units at nationally recognized institutions.	Program costs are similar to peers and comparable units at nationally recognized institutions.	Program is more expensive to operate than peers and comparable units at nationally recognized institutions.	Program is more expensive to operate than peers and comparable units at nationally recognized institutions.
k)	Program offers courses unique to its majors and provides service courses in support of numerous other academic units.	Program provides instruction necessary for completion of several degree programs.	Program provides instruction, but SCH are low, not required by more than one or two other programs, possibly duplicating instruction in other units.	Program provides little instruction to either its own majors or those of other programs. Other units offer instruction needed for degree completion.
l)				

m)	<p>3. Demand (1 page for both internal and external, 15%) Provide narrative to analyze and summarize student interest, recruitment and placement in the context of both external and internal demand.</p> <p>External Demand - Present and anticipated future demand for this program as measured by market demand for graduates, economic/scientific/social; partnerships with external stakeholders; the uniqueness of the program. Evidence must be cited from at least one of the following sources: U.S. Department of Labor (http://www.bls.gov/OCO), the National Association of Colleges and Employers (http://naceweb.org) or the Michigan Department of Labor (http://www.milmi.org/?PAGID=67&SUBID=170), other sources may also be cited such as a professional society relevant to your program field. Review evidence of recent program graduate employment, and recent graduate program acceptance/ persistence/ completion data. Differentiate between options in consolidated programs to provide evidence for each option. Relate the program to the same or similar programs, within the state or region.</p> <p>a) Narrative provides multiple sources of evidence related to gainful employment in the field, demand for graduates in the field, student interest, and successful employment.</p>			
n)	Analysis and evidence provided that graduates of this program are successfully employed in their field of study or a related field, or successfully pursuing graduate study.	Evidence of graduates of this program are likely to find employment or admittance to graduate programs	Evidence of program demand indicates stable or decline interest. Graduates of this program are unlikely to find employment in their field of study or a related field.	No evidence or analysis provided, graduates of this program appear unlikely to be successful in employment or advanced study
o)	Evidence provided of current trends indicates that demand for this program will remain strong into the foreseeable future. Analysis provides action plan to continue growth	Analysis documents demand for this program has been generally constant over time, and economic indicators show no change into the future. Action plan provided to grow.	Demand for this program has been declining over time and indicators are this trend will continue. Analysis addresses potential actions.	No analysis and/or student demand for this program has declined to the point of few majors.
p)	Other evidence, e.g., this is the only program of its kind in the state, with growing demand from students. Evidence of program uniqueness provided	The program, while not unique in the state, is often selected by incoming students. Analysis addresses enrollment trends	The program offerings are redundant with those of one or more LSSU units.	The program offerings are redundant with both LSSU units and other institutions, with little demand by students.
q)				
r)	<p>Internal Demand – Provide evidence of student demand and the degree to which other units rely on this program for instruction or support. Include courses required by majors in other units, service courses, and general education offerings. Provide any additional information relevant to internal demand, differentiate between any options.</p> <p>a) Narrative addresses overlap of the program with other degree programs, and delivery of service courses to make effective case for continuation.</p>			

s)	Evidence of enrollment in the program and demand for the program's courses is strong and/or growing. Enrollment is in the top 25% of all programs.	Enrollment in the program (top 40%) and demand for the program's courses is steady and/or small, analysis addresses actions for growth.	Enrollment in bottom 50% for the program or steadily declined over time. Analysis provides action plan for growth	Program enrollment in lowest 30% of all programs. Services and/or courses offered by this program have significant overlap with those of other programs.
t)	Graduation requirements needed by other units are offered by this program, courses are not duplicated by other units. Analysis presents case for major in addition to service courses	Evidence presented on service courses included within this program, and analysis of the importance of major	This program offers courses that duplicate those of one or more other units. Analysis of major's role beyond service courses and/or less than 20 majors	The courses offered by this unit are not in demand (low enrollment) and very few, if any, students declare this major (< 10).
u)	Program is as large or larger than peer programs at other regional institutions, program is current and relevant.	Program is similar in size to peer programs and is able to offer viable degree and/or certificate options.	Program is smaller in size to peer programs resulting in reduced opportunities to achieve recognition or a level of distinction. Program led by 2 or fewer faculty and/or program has not maintained currency.	Program has one permanent faculty and/or few, if any, majors or service courses. Program has not maintained currency and relevance to attract/retain students.
v)	Evidence provided that required and elective courses are regularly scheduled and have strong enrollment and that the School balances course offerings to meet institutional needs.	Required and elective courses are usually scheduled, but may alternate by year.	Required and elective courses are infrequently scheduled, or are scheduled and frequently do not make, or are offered as independent study.	Required and elective courses are not scheduled regularly and courses frequently do not make as planned.
w)				

x)	<p>4. Quality (2 pages, 25%)</p> <p>Analyze and discuss the quality factors of this academic program. Review this program's incorporation of high-impact educational practices promoting student learning and engagement (http://www.neasc.org/downloads/aacu_high_impact_2008_final.pdf) Provide evidence, including but not limited to, the program's ability to attract and retain high quality students and faculty, the reputation of the program, regional/national recognition; faculty recognition; comparisons with peers; student experiences; faculty achievements in teaching, success in establishing and meeting learning goals. Review the use of effective pedagogy, and of curriculum alignment, as well as effective use of the LSSU physical environment for out-of-classroom learning experiences. Additional evidence of quality may include national program accreditation, specialized facilities or equipment. For programs with multiple options or concentrations, provide evidence of quality for each option.</p> <p>a) Narrative effectively addresses program quality and provides multiple sources of evidence.</p>			
y)	The program is accredited for the full time period by its disciplinary accrediting body. (where available) Narrative addresses accreditation and summarizes last review.	The program is accredited by its disciplinary accrediting body but has mandatory reports, actions, or sanctions. Narrative gives analysis and action plan.	No analysis provided and/or the program is on probation or in risk of losing accreditation by its disciplinary accrediting body.	The program is required or eligible for accreditation by its disciplinary accrediting body but is not accredited, or under review/sanction.
z)	Faculty in this program have received national awards and recognition for their outstanding teaching and engagement with students. Narrative provides context and relevance of award(s).	Faculty in this program have received regional and state awards and recognition for their teaching and engagement with students.	Faculty in this program have received local and university awards and recognition for their teaching and engagement with students.	Faculty in this program have not received awards or recognition for their teaching and engagement with students.
aa)	Teaching evaluations in courses taught by the program's faculty are consistently at or near the top in comparison to teaching evaluations for other programs in their college.	Teaching evaluations in courses taught by the program's faculty are above average in comparison to teaching evaluations for other programs in their college.	Teaching evaluations in courses taught by the program's faculty are below average in comparison to teaching evaluations for other programs in their college.	Teaching evaluations in courses taught by the program's faculty are consistently at or near the bottom in comparison to teaching evaluations for other programs in their college.
bb)	The program offers extensive opportunities for students to engage in cutting edge study and research.	The program offers numerous opportunities for students to engage in cutting edge study and research.	The program offers limited opportunities for students to engage in cutting edge study and research.	The program offers no opportunities for students to engage in cutting edge study and research

cc)	Evidence provided that all graduates engage in interdisciplinary study and research.	The program offers numerous opportunities for students to engage in interdisciplinary study and research, most students participate	The program offers limited opportunities for students to engage in interdisciplinary study and research, or limited student participation	The program offers no opportunities for students to engage in interdisciplinary study and research.
dd)	Percentage of the programs' undergraduates participating in research, service learning, international or other experiential learning experiences is above average for peers and like units at LSSU	Percentage of the programs' undergraduates participating in research, service learning, international or other experiential learning experiences is average for peers and like units at LSSU	Percentage of the programs' undergraduates participating in research, service learning, international or other experiential learning experiences is below average for peers and like units at LSSU.	Few or none of the programs' undergraduates participate in research, service learning, international or other experiential learning experiences.
ee)	External reviews, where applicable, indicate that this instructional program is of the highest quality.	External reviews indicate that this instructional program is acceptable.	External reviews indicate that this instructional program needs improvement.	External reviews indicate that this instructional program is inadequate.
ff)	Evidence provided that graduates of the program are systematically and effectively engaged in an array of experiential learning, or other High Impact Practices. Most or all graduates participate.	The program offers experiential learning and High Impact Practices opportunities to their students. Evidence provided that most students participate in some activity.	The program has limited opportunities for engagement in high impact practices, including experiential learning opportunities, or low student participation	Experiential learning opportunities are not offered by this program or used by graduates.
gg)				

5. Assessment (2 pages, 25%).

HLC Criterion for Accreditation 4.B: *The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.*

1. *The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.*
2. *The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.*
3. *The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.*
4. *The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.*

Provide a narrative to summarize the program's effectiveness in the use of assessment data to strengthen the program and improve student learning consistent with the Criterion for Accreditation. Review the nature, quality and level of the program outcomes. Evaluate the strength of the program outcome measures and the course-program mapping. Review the progress in course assessment: course outcomes, measures and findings. Summarize assessment feedback from all stakeholders.

- a. Narrative addresses HLC Criterion, outcomes are clearly defined, lead to actionable data, evidence of the use of assessment data to make changes and evidence of the impact of those changes. Narrative provides evidence of progress in assessment and timeline for the assessment cycle leading to HLC reporting in April 2016.

hh)

ii)

ij)

All course and program outcomes are student focused, measurable, and rely on both direct and indirect measures. Administrative outcomes clearly identified. Implementation plan provides methodology for the assessment of all student learning outcomes within a 4-year rotation

At least 75% of course and program outcomes are student focused and measurable. Most outcomes have both direct and indirect measures. Findings and action plans based on assessment presented consistent with the implementation plan schedule.

At least 50% of course and program outcomes identified on the implementation plan are measurable or focused on student learning and have identified direct and indirect measures for their assessment.

Outcomes statements are not listed, are not student oriented, or are broad and not measurable, or only administrative outcomes are listed. Findings not present, not aligned to outcomes, or not consistent with implement schedule, or no implementation schedule provided

The program has established and implemented an assessment plan and accountability metrics, and has used the process to make improvements in their program. A detailed action plan summarizes program direction for the future responsible parties are identified and timelines included for all actions.

The program has established and implemented an assessment plan and accountability metrics for the program. An action plan identifies future activities, faculty involvement is evident.

The program has drafted but not yet implemented (collected data) an assessment plan and accountability metrics for the program. Actions based on assessment may be present but need documentation to support plan.

No assessment plan or accountability metrics have been developed for the program.

kk)	A program-level curriculum map (matrix) has been developed and reviewed by faculty to define how and where each program outcome will be addressed (i.e., introduced, reinforced, assessed).	A curriculum map is provided identifying outcomes by course. Assessments map to specific program outcomes for both course and program.	Some evidence of curriculum mapping, but not every program outcome is mapped to an assessment activity.	No curriculum map has been developed or implementation is not systematic.
ll)	Evidence provided of school-level review of course and program findings, and the substantial participation of faculty in processes and methodologies leading to assessment of student learning	Limited engagement of faculty at both the course and program level, all findings include action plans for improvement.	Limited engagement of faculty at either course or program level, limited evidence of the use of findings to impact student learning.	No evidence of faculty engagement in review of student learning at course or program level
mm)				
nn)	6. Opportunity Analysis (1 page, 10%) Summarize the program's long-term goals (5-10 years). Define and report on opportunities for advancing the program. Define, quantitatively and qualitatively, the obstacles to moving the program towards its long-term goals. Report on the current status of equipment/lab and other resources. Has the program kept facilities current? How will future equipment needs be met (external funding or LSSU funding)? Describe any options for continuation of the program in another format (as an emphasis, minor associate degree, etc.). Are there any duplicated efforts on campus relative to this program? Where can efficiency be increased through collaboration? Describe the curriculum or staffing changes required or resulting from these changes. Is the program currently at or below capacity, what steps can be taken to increase program effectiveness? a) Narrative provides overview of the program potential.			
oo)	Program has very high potential for growth; action plan to achieve this growth is clear and well defined.	Program has some potential for growth, action plan is complete, costs for implementation still favor program expansion.	Program currently declining and/or has potential for growth but implementation costs may exceed return from that growth. Action plan needs refinement.	Program is declining or stable, opportunities for growth not defined .
pp)	Program facilities and equipment are current and plans in place for maintenance or replacement on regular schedule. Facilities are self-funded or have external funding sources.	Program facilities are aging, action plans for maintenance and replacement is complete but may require increased university commitment.	Program facilities are aging but could be maintained with modest increase in support. Program action plan does not identify needed activities.	Program facilities are not current; no plan for upgrade, replacement. Program assessment plan does not address facility needs.

qq)	The evidence given shows strong potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.	The evidence given shows moderate potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.	The evidence given shows weak potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.	The evidence given shows a lack of potential for the program to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and adapt well to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.
rr)				
ss)	<p>7. Optional (1 page, 5%) This optional section is for a review of low-enrolled programs that are thought to not cost the institution anything to support, due to their integration with critical, mission aligned programs. Explain how integrated programs are within the school in which they reside, or within the university (other academic areas), to the point that the program(s) is/are offered at no cost to LSSU. If this section is not used, the 5% may be added to the Section above where it will most benefit the program.</p> <p>a) Narrative effectively summarizes additional evidence clearly suggests that the program should receive a much more favorable evaluation.</p>			
tt)	Additional evidence clearly suggests that the program should receive a much more favorable evaluation.	Additional evidence suggests that a program should receive a somewhat more favorable evaluation.	Evidence provided only slightly supports favorable evaluation or weakly connects to review.	Evidence provided is not relevant to program review.