Ithaca College
Academic Program Review Guidelines

Introduction: The purpose of academic program review is threefold: to ensure the continuing quality and strength of academic programs, to meet the program assessment requirements of our various accrediting agencies, and to provide an information base for institutional budgeting and planning processes.

Timeline: The dean, in consultation with departments and/or program areas, will recommend a review year for each program to the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, who may adjust the schedule in order to meet broader institutional needs, or to balance the number of programs completing reviews in any given academic year. Each program should complete the review process at least once every 7 years; the exception to this expectation is that programs that require external review as part of their disciplinary accreditation process may opt to participate in program review in the same year as their disciplinary accreditation review. The overall timeline is summarized at the end of this document; requests for additional time on any due dates in the timeline should go to Associate Provost Jeane Copenhaver-Johnson with as much advance notice as possible.

Unit of Review: Generally, the unit of review will be the academic department, and should include all courses, programs (majors & minors), degrees and curricula offered by that department. Deans may recommend a different unit of review, such as by major and minor, or by clustering majors in related subject areas. Use of any unit of review other than the department requires prior approval by the Associate Provost for Academic Programs.

Information Base: Program review reports should be based on information provided by Analytics and Institutional Research (AIR). A summary of Analytics and Institutional Research information is available at http://www.ithaca.edu/ir/docs/progrev/ Departments may include additional research-based information as appropriate to their program areas. To request additional information from AIR, please complete the online information request form available on the home page of AIR's website (http://www.ithaca.edu/ir/).

Guidelines and Format for Program Review Reports:
Completed reports should be approximately 30 to 35 pages in length, not including appendices. Please include page numbers and a table of contents for the final submission. Programs completing a specialized accreditation review in the same year as their IC Academic Program Review may submit their report in an alternative format as required by the specialized accreditor; these programs should consult with Associate Provost Copenhaver-Johnson about the alternative format, and will be asked to provide supplemental information if the alternative format does not cover all of the elements listed here. If an alternative format is used, please include a cover memo or other summary mapping the submission with the specific program review requirements outlined in this document.

Section One: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (approximately one page in length, typically written at the end)
- Summarize the main conclusions of the report, including any changes planned as a result of the program review process.

Section Two: PROGRAM MISSION AND GOALS
- Provide the department's mission statement and its long-range and short-range goals.
- Relate these to the mission, goals and strategic plan of the college and the school.

- Describe progress toward the attainment of program goals.
- Identify specific program strengths, including innovative program features.
- Describe the most critical issues and challenges facing the department and the steps planned to address them.

Section Three: COLLABORATIONS
- Describe departmental efforts in place to participate in and support student recruitment and/or success.
- Describe any relationships your department has with internal and external programs and/or organizations (e.g., other academic programs, off-campus entities such as Longview).
- Include any relationships the department may have with other fields or disciplines within the college, such as interdisciplinary courses, joint programs, minors, and other collaborative offerings.

Section Four: CURRICULUM
- Describe the structure of the curriculum and the rationale for that structure.
- Include introductory, intermediate and advanced levels of curriculum, as well as how the Integrative Core Curriculum and other institution-wide requirements and curricular goals are addressed.
- Describe how the curriculum meets the standards and expectations established nationally and internationally within the discipline(s) addressed by the program.
- Explain how the curriculum serves the mission and goals of the department, school and college.
- Discuss any curricular contributions the unit makes outside of the majors/minors offered within the department (e.g., ICC, courses that directly serve other programs across campus)

Section Five: ASSESSMENT
- List the student learning outcomes associated with majors, minors and any other programs as appropriate to the department's main discipline(s) and subject areas.
- Describe the methods used to assess student attainment of these learning outcomes. Describe how the department determines whether or not its individual courses and its programs are successful, and how the department decides what improvements or changes are needed.
- Provide an analysis of assessment results, with emphasis on any changes made in response to information gained through assessment efforts.

Section Six: FACULTY PROFILE
- Provide (in an appendix) a current *curriculum vitae* for each faculty member that includes scholarly and professional accomplishments since the last program review.
- Summarize the department's collective plans for faculty development, linking them to the program's mission and/or goals.

Section Seven: DATA AND ANALYSIS
- Identify data trends over the past five years, including data such as enrollment, number of students applying for major(s), student credit hours generated, faculty FTE (full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty), faculty-student ratios, degrees awarded, and cost of instruction, as well as placements and attainments of departmental graduates.
- Provide an analysis of those trends, specifying what the data demonstrate about the department's programs, their performance over time, and what the data trends suggest for the future planning and goals of the department.

- Describe how the department's data trends relate to larger trends outside the institution for the appropriate discipline(s) and subject area(s), including benchmarking against other comparable programs.

Section Eight: RESOURCES
- Describe how well the department's budget has met its needs over the last five years.
- Identify any anticipated future needs for personnel, space, funding and/or other resources, and explain how those needs relate to departmental assessments and departmental/institutional goals.

Section Nine: PROPOSED ACTION PLAN
Provide the department's proposed action plan for the next three to five years to strategically move forward in the areas of curriculum and program development, student learning outcomes, staffing, resource needs, and other aspects of the department's work. This plan should result from analysis and assessment of the information and data gathered for the program review process, including consideration of the department's mission and goals and the outside evaluator's report.

OUTSIDE EVALUATORS
As part of the program review process, outside evaluators should be engaged to review the department's curriculum, faculty, student learning outcomes and assessment data. In particular, the outside evaluator is to answer the following questions:
- Are there any gaps or duplications in the program curriculum that should be addressed?
- Do you recommend any changes to the assessment process being used by the program?
- Taken as a whole, are the faculty members' credentials and experience appropriate for the scope and level of the program?
- Are there any gaps in the faculty resource needing to be filled?
- Are budgetary and other resources sufficient for effective operation of the program?
- What is your assessment of the data analysis section of the report?
- Are there any additional larger trends outside the institution that should be taken into consideration?
- What do you recommend for inclusion in the program's proposed action plan?

Depending on the size and complexity of the department being reviewed, the outside evaluation may be done by a single individual, or by a team of up to three for larger and more complex curricular areas. These individuals should be specialists in the department's academic and/or professional discipline areas, with qualifications similar to those of faculty at the level of associate professor or full professor. Outside evaluators should have no direct professional or personal connection to Ithaca College, or to any member of the department being reviewed.

Outside evaluator(s) are required to conduct a campus visit, including time with the Dean at the beginning and end of the visit, time with current students, and time with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs. Evaluators should provide a written report of 7 to 10 pages, submitted to the Dean and included as an appendix to the program review report. Names and profiles of proposed outside reviewers, as well as the proposed expenses for travel and honoraria, should be provided to Associate Provost Jeane Copenhaver-Johnson no later than December 1st, for advance review and approval. Departments may wish to provide one or more additional reviewers' names, in case the first choice reviewers are not available for the desired visit dates.

Travel expenses and honoraria for outside evaluators should be paid for by the department, and will be reimbursed out of the Provost's Office once the travel expenses have been finalized. Total cost per reviewer should be about $2,000, including travel expenses; a stipend of $500 plus expenses is typical in most fields for work of this kind. Some departments may find that their particular field of study requires a stipend of more than $500 per day; stipends over that amount require advance approval from Associate Provost Copenhaver-Johnson. Questions about the reimbursement process should go to MaryAnn Taylor.

APC Role in Program Review
A subcommittee of the Academic Policy Committee (APC) reviews each report twice: once in draft form as Sections 2 through 8 to provide formative feedback, and again in final form including Sections 1 and 9. Receipt of the draft reports is acknowledged by the full APC in February or early March, and receipt of the final reports is acknowledged by the full APC at its May meeting. The subcommittee's role is:
1. to conduct a preliminary review of Sections 2 through 8 early in the spring semester to determine whether the report is in accordance with the Academic Program Review Guidelines,
2. to conduct an additional review before the May meeting of the full APC to determine whether the evidence provided in the report adequately supports the conclusions presented in Section 9, and
3. to forward their determinations to the full APC for their consideration.

The role of the full APC is to review the work of the subcommittee, and on that basis to provide a recommendation to the Provost/VPEA regarding the program review documents. APC's recommendations to the Provost/VPEA focus on how well the proposed action plan is supported by the self-study and outside reviewer report rather than on specific elements of the program. Potential APC recommendations appear in the table below:

APC Recommendation	Description of Recommendation
The program review strongly supports the action plan	All elements complete Action plan effectively references rest of review including external evaluation
The program review supports the action plan	All elements complete with only minor issues Action plan references rest of review including external evaluation, some suggestions better supported than others
The program review moderately supports the action plan	Some elements may be incomplete or have some issues Action plan available but doesn't necessarily reference rest of review including external evaluation and/or doesn't effectively include relevant material in suggestions Review essentially complete but may be some major issues
The program review fails to support the action plan	Elements incomplete or missing, some major issues Action plan unavailable, doesn't reference rest of review and/or doesn't do so effectively, fails to include all relevant material Review incomplete and/or major issues with links to action plan

Timeline Summary:
September/October, 2019: Department Data (from Institutional Research) become available for each department.

<u>Fall semester, 2019</u>: Departments participating in 2019-20 program reviews begin the review process, including an overview meeting with Associate Provost Copenhaver-Johnson to take place no later than October 31.

<u>December 2, 2019</u>: Names and profiles of proposed outside evaluators due to Associate Provost for Academic Programs, as well as any proposals for evaluator stipends over $500.

<u>January, 2020</u>: Sections 2 through 8 due to Dean for review (Dean will only review for errors of fact and usage of Ithaca-specific acronyms or terms that should be explained for external audiences). *Departments should work with their Dean during the fall semester to identify the date that the draft report should be submitted to the Dean so that Sections 2 through 8 can be submitted by the January 31st deadline below*. These reviews must be completed before the report is sent to the external reviewer. Reports are to be completed in electronic form.

<u>January 31, 2020</u>: Sections 2 through 8 due to the Dean, Academic Policies Committee (apc@ithaca.edu), and to the Associate Provost for Academic Programs, with a copy to outside evaluator(s).

<u>February, 2020</u>: Outside evaluators conduct campus visits, and prepare their reports. APC Program Review subcommittee conducts a preliminary review of Sections 2 through 8, and provides written formative feedback to the Department/Program Chair, Dean, and Associate Provost for Academic Programs.

<u>Februrary 28, 2020</u>: Formative feedback from APC subcommittee due to Chair, Dean, and Associate Provost for Academic Programs. It is expected that this feedback will be used to revise sections 2 through 8 for the final version to be submitted in April.

<u>March 13, 2020</u>: Outside evaluator reports due to Dean and Program Chair.

<u>April 1, 2020</u>: Completed program review reports due to Dean, Academic Policies Committee (apc@ithaca.edu), and Associate Provost for Academic Programs; completed reports should incorporate information received from outside evaluators. Completed reports should include final versions of Sections 2 through 8, a one-page executive summary (Section 1), a proposed action plan (Section 9), and the outside evaluator's report, as well as a table of contents listing each section and all appendices. Reports are to be submitted in electronic form.

<u>April, 2020</u>: APC subcommittee forwards its determinations to the full APC.

<u>May 1, 2020</u>: Full APC meeting, with the APC subcommittee determinations on the agenda.

<u>Summer, 2020</u>: Follow up meeting with Department Chair, Dean, Associate Provost for Academic Programs, and Provost to discuss next steps for report.

<u>June 1, 2021</u>: One to two page follow up due from Department Chair to the Dean and Associate Provost for Academic Programs, documenting changes made to that point as a result of the program review process and identifying changes that are to be pursued in the 2021-22 academic year.

PLEASE COPY ALL DOCUMENTS & INFORMATION TO

apc@ithaca.edu

The rubric below is used by APC in evaluating program review reports.

Program Review Rubric

Program Reviewed: _____

Guideline addressed			Guideline	Additional comments (for committee discussion only)
Yes	**No**	**Some**		
			Section 2: Program Mission & Goals	
			Provide the department's mission statement and its long-range and short-range goals.	
			Relate these to the mission, goals and strategic plan of the college and the school.	
			Describe progress toward the attainment of program goals	
			Identify specific program strengths, including innovative program features	
			Describe the most critical issues and challenges facing the department and the steps planned to address them.	
			Section 3: Collaborations	
			Describe departmental efforts in place to participate in and support student recruitment.	
			Describe any relationships your department has with internal and external programs and/or organizations.	
			Include any relationships the department may have with other fields or disciplines within the college, such as interdisciplinary courses, joint programs, minors, and other collaborative offerings.	
			Section 4: Curriculum	
			Describe the structure of the curriculum and the rationale for that structure	
			Include introductory, intermediate and advanced levels of curriculum, as well as how the Integrative Core Curriculum and other institution-wide requirements and curricular goals are addressed.	
			Describe how the curriculum meets the standards and expectations established nationally and internationally within the discipline(s) addressed by the program	
			Explain how the curriculum serves the mission and goals of the department, school and college	
			Section Five: Assessment	
			Describe how the department assesses the success of its individual courses and its programs	
			List the student learning outcomes associated with majors, minors and any other programs as appropriate to the department's main discipline(s) and subject areas.	

| | | | Describe the methods used to assess student attainment of these learning outcomes | |
| | | | Provide an analysis of assessment results, including any changes made in response to information gained through assessment efforts. | |

Section Six: Faculty Profile

| | | | Provide (in an appendix) a current *curriculum vitae* for each faculty member that includes scholarly and professional accomplishments since the last program review | |
| | | | Summarize the department's collective plans for faculty development | |

Section Seven: Data & Analysis

| | | | Identify and provide analysis for data trends over the past five years, including enrollment data, number of students applying for major(s), student credit hours generated, faculty FTE (full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty), faculty-student ratios, degrees awarded, and cost of instruction, as well as placements and attainments of departmental graduates | |
| | | | Describe how the department's data trends relate to larger trends outside the institution for the appropriate discipline(s) and subject area(s), including benchmarking against other comparable programs | |

Section Eight: Resources

| | | | Summarize the departmental budget over the last five years. | |
| | | | Describe anticipated needs for personnel, space, funding and other resources, in relationship to departmental assessments and goals. | |