

**PROPOSAL FOR RE-ACTIVATION OF UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC
PROGRAM REVIEW AT WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY**

5/25/05

RATIONALE: The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Accreditation Association expects all accredited institutions to have in place a regular system of academic program review that permits an institution both to evaluate and continuously improve the quality of all academic programs. While the Ohio Board of Regents provides guidelines for regular review of all graduate programs, it does not provide such guidelines for undergraduate programs. Rather, the expectation is that each institution would develop its own system of regular program review for undergraduate programs. Other Ohio institutions do indeed have in place ongoing systems of academic program review, as do most institutions around the country.

In the not-so-distant past, Wright State University, like other higher education institutions, had in place an academic program review process that provided five-year reviews of all academic programs; that system seems to have gradually, but unintentionally, lapsed, however, no doubt in part because of the comprehensive review, utilizing the Shirley model, the university conducted of all programs and units in preparation for the development of the 1998-2003 strategic plan. Now that the 1998-2003 strategic plan has been implemented, consistent with the findings of that series of comprehensive program and unit reviews, it is time to return to systematic academic program review, ensuring that it reflects the new criteria for accreditation of the Higher Learning Commission of NCA. Aligning academic program review with the new criteria for accreditation will also greatly facilitate institutional accreditation self-study processes in the future.

PROPOSAL:

That the Executive Committee of the Wright State University Faculty Senate appoint a **University Ad Hoc Committee for Undergraduate Academic Program Review** with the following charge: to review, on a seven-year cycle, all undergraduate degree programs on the Dayton and Lake campuses. A draft program review template, aligned with NCA criteria for accreditation, is attached.

The primary purpose of academic program review of undergraduate programs is to give the program faculty the opportunity to conduct a self-study that will a) describe program mission, strengths and weaknesses relative to appropriate benchmarks, including best practices; b) develop an appropriate plan and timeline for program improvement; and 3) request the resources necessary to make those improvements.

The University Ad Hoc Committee for Undergraduate Academic Program Review would review the program self-study relative to the requisite program review template, and within the context of ongoing program assessment; request

additional information where needed; and either endorse the plan for improvement and/or make alternative suggestions for the program's consideration. The Committee might, for example, request a follow-up report from the program and/or department at any point of the seven-year program review cycle. Outcomes of the Committee's review would be shared annually with the Faculty Senate, the Council of Deans, the Provost, and the general faculty.

Programs that have been or will be reviewed by external agencies for the purposes of accreditation within the regular seven-year cycle would be exempt from the above academic program review process. Such programs would still be asked, however, to submit their self-study and plans for improvement to the University Ad Hoc Committee for Undergraduate Academic Program Review. They would also be asked to respond to questions from the template related to online degree programs, where applicable, and they would be given the opportunity to request resources for program improvements.

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE:

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will appoint the members of the University Ad Hoc Committee for Undergraduate Academic Program Review as follows: one faculty representative from each degree-granting undergraduate college, including the Lake Campus; the chair or his/her designated representative of University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee (UCAPC), the University General Education Committee (UGEC), and the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Committee; a representative from the University College and from Student Government; the Vice President for Curriculum and Instruction or his/her designee; and one *ex-officio* faculty liaison for each program being reviewed.

The Committee should be appointed by the end of spring quarter 2005, and should get its work underway beginning fall quarter 2005. Training for committee members will be provided as needed.

NCA Criteria

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity

Criterion Statement: The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Core Component - 1A. The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.

Core Component - 1B. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

Core Component - 1C. Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization

Core Component - 1D. The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

Core Component - 1E. The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future

Criterion Statement: The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Core Component - 2A. The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

Core Component - 2B. The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Core Component - 2C. The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Core Component - 2D. All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

Criterion Statement: The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

Core Component - 3A. The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

Core Component - 3B. The organization values and supports effective teaching.

Core Component - 3C. The organization creates effective learning environments.

Core Component - 3D. The organization's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge

Criterion Statement: The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

Core Component - 4A. The organization demonstrates, through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.

Core Component - 4B. The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.

Core Component - 4C. The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

Core Component - 4D. The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

Criterion Five: Engagement and Service

Criterion Statement: As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Core Component - 5A. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

Core Component - 5B. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.

Core Component - 5C. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

Core Component - 5D. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

*Undergraduate Academic Program Review
Draft of Template*

Name of Program:

Name and contact information for person completing the review:

Indicate whether the program is

_____ on campus

_____ online

_____ both

NCA Criterion 1—Mission and Integrity

NCA Criterion 2—Preparing for the Future

NCA Criterion 3—Student Learning and Effective Teaching

NCA Criterion 4—Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge

NCA Criterion 5—Engagement and Service

I. Program Mission (NCA Criterion 1 and Criterion 5)

- program mission statement (should identify constituency served) **(1A, 1B)**
- consistency with university mission **(1C, 1E)**
- consistency with college mission **(1C, 1E)**
- consistency of goals, learning objectives with program mission **(1C)**
- extent to which program prepares students to "live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society" **(4C)**
- extent to which program, through its curriculum and co-curriculum, fosters civic engagement and social responsibility **(5A, 5C)**
- extent to which program fosters life-long learning **(4A)**
- interrelationship with general education **(1C, 4B)**
- interrelationship with other WSU programs **(1C)**
- community engagement **(5C, 5D)**

II. Program Description (NCA Criterion 2)

- brief history of program, emphasizing past seven years (e.g., changes in administration, change in program direction, new degrees, minors, or certificates, de- or re-activation of program), including recommendations of any previous internal and/or external program reviews
- number of students served
- number of majors
- number of minors
- number enrolled in certificate program (if applicable)
- number of faculty
- student/faculty ratio, average class size
- balance in rank of program faculty
- number of staff
- diversity (gender, race, ethnicity) of majors, faculty, and staff

- budget
- facilities and equipment/instrumentation
- technology and information resources and services
- program cost

III. Program Effectiveness (**NCA Criterion 3 and Criterion 4**)

- achievement of student learning outcomes (Please summarize program assessment findings for past five years and subsequent improvements to program) **(3A)**
- student retention rate **(3A)**
- number of graduates annually **(3A)**
- placement of graduates (e.g., employment, graduate study) **(3A)**
- teaching effectiveness **(3B, 3D)**
- faculty productivity (e.g., publications, grants) **(4A)**
- interrelations of program's teaching, research, service activities **(3A-D, 4A-C, 5 A-C)**
- integration of technology into curriculum and instruction **(3C)**
- description of how program ensures that it is always current **(4C)**
- "comparative advantage" (e.g., distinctiveness in terms of students served, differentiation from programs offered at other regional institutions, strengths attributable to collaborative/interdisciplinary nature of program, etc.)

If the program is online, respond to the following questions (**drawn from NCA Best Practices**):

- Is the online program taught by the same faculty as the on-campus program?
- How do the retention and graduation rates of the online and on-campus programs compare?
- How does the achievement of learning outcomes by online students compare with those by on-campus students?
- How does student evaluation of instruction for online classes compare to that for on-campus courses?
- How does the online program provide for appropriate interaction (synchronous or asynchronous) between students and instructor and among students?
- How does access to academic and technical support programs compare for online and on-campus students and for online and on-campus faculty?
- How does the program provide a coherent plan for student access to all courses necessary to complete the program (or provide clear notification of requirements not included in electronic offerings)?
- How have issues of workload, compensation, and ownership of intellectual property been addressed by the program?
- How have issues of security of personal information been addressed?

IV. Program Needs/Areas in Need of Improvement

Summarize the program needs (e.g., personnel, facilities, equipment) identified in this program review and the areas in need of improvement.

V. Proposed Improvement Action Plan

Summarize the actions that will be taken in response to the findings of this program assessment. Provide a timeline that indicates how these changes will be implemented and assessed over the next seven years.