Academic Program Review Guidelines
for
Academic Departments/Academic Programs

Updated May 2023

Contents

Purpose of Academic Program Review

As a Jesuit Catholic university, Marquette is committed to the pursuit of excellence in service of its educational mission. To ensure that its academic programs maintain the highest standards of excellence, the University employs a program review process that is data-driven, forward-looking, and outcomes-based. The process is also designed to help academic units align themselves with the University strategic plan.

Program reviews are designed to support long-term planning efforts, focus on areas that offer the potential for innovation, distinctiveness and preeminence, and assure the most efficient and effective use of resources. The process is designed to be institutionally consistent and yet flexible enough to accommodate the culture and goals of individual units and allow the University to adapt its review process over time.

Administration of the Program Review Process

The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dr. John Su (john.su@marquette.edu) manages and supports the academic program review process. **All questions regarding the process should be directed to Dr. Su.**

During the program review process, units should involve faculty and students, particularly during the self-study and the visit stages. As appropriate, a department may make use of the expertise of standing committees such as undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees, assessment committees, t610r00912 ogram Review Process

Academic Programs Subject to Review

An academic program is defined as a unit or group of units dedicated to achieving research, education, and/or service goals that advance the university mission (academic support units follow a separate review process). The units of analysis for academic program review are typically departments but could include clusters of programs across departments or colleges (interdisciplinary programs).

All academic programs are required to participate in program review. The Office of the Provost publishes a calendar of program reviews, which occur within a 7 year cycle.

Academic programs to be reviewed include:

Concentrations or majors within degree programs
Interdisciplinary majors and minors

Accredited academic programs:

Accredited academic programs also must go through the program review process, but materials from accreditation may be used so that the process is not cumbersome. Some accredited programs use the program review to raise issues that they believe need to be addressed before their accreditation visit. Others may wish to use the review as a run through for their accreditation visit. And yet others use the review as a follow up to an accreditation visit. The Dean and the Provost can determine what strategy works best for each individual unit. In any case, an action plan for the next 7 years will be developed.

outside of the regular review cycle, in order to address an immediate challenge, discuss an opportunity for collaboration, or explore a cluster of related programs or interests.

STEPS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

An academic program review process typically spans 3 to 4 semesters. (See Program Review Checklist and Timeline on pages 7-8).

SEMESTER ONE

discussed   s which the external reviewers will use as a point of comparison in their review. See page 9 for Peer and Aspirant Programs, page 10 for Guiding Questions for Strategic Issues, and page 11 for Strategic Issues Statement and Peer/Aspirant Programs.

The chair of the Program Review Council and the Provost identify the reviewers. The review will be scheduled.

The academic unit begins its self-study. See Self-Study Template on pages 12-15.

Data needed to support the self-study are gathered by the academic unit from several units on campus, although much of the data are available from the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. The program review checklist and timeline explain where to get the data for the self-study.

SEMESTER TWO

Self-Study. The academic unit is responsible for compiling and writing the self-study. Unit faculty and staff should participate in the process as appropriate. The main purpose of the self-study is to assess program quality and effectiveness, and to set strategic goals and priorities that can guide future planning and budget decisions. Units being reviewed should use the self-study

program reviews. See Selality and effect

Office of the Provost and Dean provide feedback on self-study	Vice Provost	3 weeks prior to visit

Peer and Aspirant Programs

Through the Strategic Planning process, the university has identified 22 peer and aspirant institutions. In identifying the 3-5 peer and aspirant programs which the unit wishes the external reviewers to consider while reviewing the unit, academic units are requested to consider the list below. However, most important is that the unit chooses peer and aspirant programs in the discipline.

Boston College (MA)
Case Western Reserve 112 0 612 79.a(se)3(rv)-6(e)4(112 0 610DU g3(ra(a)4sinBTy568Oa)4Hm0 g0 G[B)-2(os

SECTION 1: Results of Previous Review (2 pages)

a. *Provide the dates of the most recent previous review and a brief summary (at most, 2 pages) of the review, including the names and home institutions of the reviewers, the outcomes of the review and any unresolved issues from the review. If the previous review is available, the unit may include it as an optional appendix.*

SECTION 2: Strategic Issues Statement (2 pages) and Peer/Aspirant Programs (1 page)

a. *Include 1-*

d. Time to Degree
    a. *Review the data in **Appendix III, Time to Degree** in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, Tables 3-5. Comment on the graduation rates and the time to degree. Are these in alignment with respect to department student outcome goals?*

SECTION 5: Student Outcomes (2 pages)

a. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
    1. *Describe your processes for obtaining information about student learning in your programs. Refer to the Assessment Process Rating Guide provided by the University Assessment Committee in **Appendix IV, Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**, and add any clarifying information.*
    2. *Give examples of how you have used evidence of student learning to improve teaching, curriculum, and decision-making in your program.*

b. High Impact Learning Experiences
    1. *Please identify signature high impact learning experiences (as defined by AACU) available to undergraduates in the department and participation rates in **Appendix V, High Impact Learning Experiences**, if available.*
    2. *Please highlight any other unique pedagogical practices available to undergraduates in the department and participation rates, it available.*

c. Post-Graduation Student Outcomes
    1. *Briefly analyze post-graduation outcomes for undergraduate and graduate students. Please reference the data in **Appendix VI, Post-Graduation Student Outcomes**.*
    2. *For graduate students, discuss post-graduation outcomes (e.g., academic appointments, post-doctoral appointment, industry positions, community service, etc.) compared with departmental goals for graduates of the program.*

d. Student and/or Employer Feedback
    1. *Discuss and analyze the data in **Appendix VII, Student and or Employer Feedback**. If you wish to add any additional student survey data or employer feedback, please include and discuss the results here.*

SECTION 6: Teaching and Instructional Capacity (1 page)

a. Teaching and Instruction
    1. *onal capacity. This might include faculty teaching load, sections taught, student credit hours by major and non-majors, percent of courses taught by tenure track faculty, and trends in class size. Please reference the data in **Appendix VIII, Teaching and Instructional Capacity**.*

b. Instructional Facilities and Technology
    1. *For current and for planned or potential new programs, briefly discuss the capacity and condition of the teaching and learning environment, including classrooms, labs, and technology.*

Outcomes and Action Plan Template

The action plan will be created by the unit and approved by the Dean and the Provost and the recommendations will be integrated into the annual planning process, as appropriate. Please fill out one table for each strategic issue and the relevant recommendations.

Please include the following:

> Cover Page:
> Academic Unit or Academic Support Unit
> Dean / Department Chair or Director
> Semester and Year of Review
> Date Submitted

I.   Strategic Issues Statement and list of peer/aspirant programs

II.   External Review Team Recommendations

III.   Program Review Council Recommendations

IV.   Outcomes and Action Plan (a narrative may also be included)

Strategic Issue:

Recommendation	Action	Responsible	Date Completed