ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDE

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Durant, Oklahoma

2012-2013

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Internal program review began at Southeastern in October, 1984, when the Institutional Research and Planning Committee (since renamed the Organized Research and Program Review Committee) was asked to develop a program evaluation process. The impetus to develop academic program review at Southeastern came from a recommendation made by The Higher Learning Commission: A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, in the Spring of 1984, and from a concurrent movement within the state of Oklahoma.

The Southeastern Guidelines for Program Review were completed in May, 1985, and were pilot-tested with five programs during the 1985-86 Academic Year. Subsequently, 14 programs were evaluated in 1986-87, and 15 programs were evaluated in 1987-88. The four major lessons learned from the initial three years of experience were: (1) the use of external consultants to evaluate academic programs was viewed as very positive, (2) program evaluation had been beneficial to the institution, (3) the time required for the preparation of program self-study reports was overly demanding in light of other faculty responsibilities, and (4) the quantity of narrative provided in self-study reports became burdensome to deal with in subsequent steps of the review process. The revised program self-study guidelines (Version 5) responded to the lessons learned from the initial three years of experience. In addition, the self-study guidelines were modified to conform more closely to the program review policy adopted by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in 1985.

The fifth version of the Program Review Guidelines was used to evaluate 13 programs in 1988-89 and 12 programs in 1989-90. During June 1987, the academic areas at SOSU were reorganized into four schools, each led by an academic dean. Experience with the new academic structure, and the appearance of assessment on the horizon led to the following recommendations:
(1) all programs (both undergraduate and graduate) in a department should be evaluated in one year,
(2) all programs within a school should be evaluated during the same year, (3) self-study procedures should be changed to integrate assessment activities and findings into the self-study report, (4) Program Review processes should be examined to see if the total process could be expedited, yet retain appropriate checks and balances, (5) Program Review recommendations need to be linked more clearly with institutional planning processes and be integrated more fully into budget preparation processes, and (6) the role of the Teacher Education Council and Dean of Education should be formally clarified for the evaluation of Teacher Education programs. These recommendations have been incorporated into the current revision (Version 6), except for the sixth recommendation, which is still under study.

Hence, these guidelines have been refined in the crucible of practice, and they should be regarded as an approach to program evaluation that seems appropriate for one regional state university serving a rural environment: Southeastern Oklahoma.

"We must spend more time looking inward to our own wits and internal human resources, instead of looking upward and outward for institutional support." Dennis Johnson, author of "A Departmental Marketing Audit"

PROSPECTUS: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
AT SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Review seeks to bring about the improvement of the academic programs offered by Southeastern. The immediate beneficiaries of program enhancements will be the students who are enrolled in these programs, and the ultimate beneficiaries will be the taxpayers of Oklahoma who provide the resources that sustain Southeastern. The concepts of quality, value, outcomes, and effective use of resources are fundamental issues to be addressed by the process of program review. Program review is defined as the systematic, periodic, and comprehensive evaluation of the academic programs offered by Southeastern. A program is defined as a sequence of courses that lead to a degree or certificate. Academic majors, major-minors, and general education would be the primary programs to be addressed by program review.

The general purposes of program review are described in the following statements.

- Program review will provide a process to verify that each program is achieving its stated goals, and to reaffirm that those goals are appropriate.

- Program review will provide an opportunity to identify needed improvements in programs, and to develop strategies to accomplish these improvements.

- Program review should be the cornerstone of an institutional planning process that facilitates improvements in courses, curricula, and instructional methodology.

- Program review will provide a means to assess those programs that are no longer serving an identifiable societal need, and develop an appropriate recommendation regarding the expenditure of limited tax dollars.

The specific goals of program review at Southeastern include the following:

- To involve units (programs, departments, and divisions) in an assessment of their current goals, objectives, and activities in relation to institution-wide goals.

- To begin the process of collecting output and outcomes information appropriate to each unit.

- To begin the process of: (1) identifying the resources (facilities, finances, and personnel) used in each unit, and (2) assembling entry-level (input) information that describes the characteristics of students in the programs of each unit.

- To provide a basis for recommendations regarding: (1) internal allocations in the preparation of annual operating budgets, and (2) reallocations (in the form of budget adjustments) during the operating year.

- To provide a basis for the formulation of both immediate and long-range plans, designed to enhance the viability of the programs in each unit.

Institutions who have implemented Program Review Processes have reported the following benefits from such activities.

- Improvement in academic quality and an understanding of quality.

- Development of priorities among programs.

- Identification of funds for allocation.

- Heightened morale and optimism about the ability of the institution to respond to changing conditions in the future.

- Increased awareness of the needs of students.

- Increased consideration of alternative ways to develop and deliver programs for students.

- Improved opportunities for interdepartmental and inter-institutional comparisons of quality and content.

- Improved capacity for planning and for decisions on the allocation of resources.

- Improved early warning of impending difficulties in a particular program.

- Help in clarifying institutional missions.

- Encouragement of inter-institutional cooperation.

- Help in promoting better institutional management.

- Help in clarifying program goals.

"An unexamined life is not worth living." Plato, Apology

PROTOCOL FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
AT SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Preparation of a Program Self-Study Report by the Department Faculty.

2. Evaluation of the Program by an External Consultant.

3. Final Evaluation of all Reports by the Organized Research and Program Review Committee.

    This includes an evaluation of the program and the perusal of both sets of recommendations for the program. If both sets of recommendations are generally consistent with the self-study report and other information, the Committee will communicate its findings to the department and dean. Should there be significant differences in the recommendations, or significant variations between the recommendations and self-study report, the Committee should schedule a formal conference with the department to resolve these differences and/or variations. If the department believes that the consultant's report and recommendations are not valid, the department chair may request a conference with the Committee to respond and/or present additional evidence. After appropriate considerations, the Committee will communicate its recommendations to the dean and department.

4. Review and Prioritization by the Dean of Instruction.

    The role of the dean will be to review the self-study report and departmental recommendations, consultant's report and recommendations, Organized Research and Program Review Committee's response, and prioritize the recommendations of the different programs to reflect the priorities of the school.

5. Conference Between the Dean and Vice-President of Academic Affairs.

    The purpose of the conference is to provide the Dean an opportunity to discuss the total package of recommendations with the Vice-President. After review by the Vice-President, the recommendations will be integrated into institutional priorities.

    At this particular step of review the Dean and Vice-President have the option of involving other groups or individuals such as the Department Chairs, Academic Council, Graduate Council, Teacher Education Council, Curriculum Committee, Institutional Assessment Committee, Graduate Dean, other Vice-Presidents, and the President.

6. Closure: Memorandum of Understanding or a Plan of Action.

    This statement will be developed by the Academic Vice-President. The memorandum will be distributed to the Dean, appropriate departments, the Organized Research and Program Review Committee, and the Office of Student Learning and Research. The memorandum will also become a part of the Program Review Record.

7. Implementation of Recommendations.

CALENDAR FOR PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES

<u>Approximate Dates</u>	<u>Activity</u>
September 2012-February 2013	Data Collection by Academic Affairs; Develop Roster of Potential Peer Evaluators
November-December 2012	SUMMAs for Targeted Classes
February 2013	AVPAA Orientation Meeting with Department Chairs and Dean of Instruction
January-October 2013	Program Self-Study; Self-Study Report Due
January-May 2013	Peer Evaluators Identified by May 10, 2013
October 2013	Self-Study Reports Provided to Peer Evaluators; Site Visits Arranged by Academic Affairs
October-November 2013	Site Visits by Peer Evaluators
November-December 2013	Reports from Peer Evaluators Due to Academic Affairs (14 days after visit)
January-March 2014	Organized Research and Program Review Committee Recommendations to Academic Affairs
April 2014	Dean of Instruction Reviews and Prioritizes Recommendations
May 2014	Conference between Dean of Instruction and Vice President for Academic Affairs
June 2014	Memorandum of Understanding from the Vice President for Academic Affairs

ORGANIZED RESEARCH AND PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Function

The responsibility of the Committee will be to review, evaluate, and make recommendations about academic programs as they are formally reviewed in the program review process. Specific functions of the Committee will be to: (1) conduct a preliminary editorial review of each program self-study report, (2) review the resumes of prospective consultants and participate in any decision to initiate an evaluation of a program by peer-reviewers from other institutions, (3) review the external evaluation report, (4) evaluate the program self-study report, peruse both sets of recommendations to determine if they are valid relative to the report and other information available to the Committee, and develop any additional program recommendations deemed appropriate by the Committee, (5) conduct conferences with the department, if needed, to clarify any discrepancies in the program review recommendations, (6) resolve any differences (when possible) between the departmental and consultant recommendations, or issue a third party report, and (7) Prepare a final report of Committee recommendations for each program.

Procedures

The Committee will coordinate its activities through the Vice-President for Academic Affairs (or his designated representative), who will officially communicate with each department having a program under review. The Committee will have the option of utilizing one or more SOSU faculty as ad hoc reviewers, whose role will be to assist the Committee in reading review reports and evaluating specific programs. The ad hoc reviewer(s) would be allowed to vote with the panel on recommendations and matters affecting the specific program. A regular Committee member will abstain from participation when there is a conflict of interest, such as when a program from the member's department is under review. An ad hoc substitute will be appointed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs for this specific situation.

Membership

The Organized Research and Assessment Committee will be composed of five faculty members. Two faculty are to be chosen from the School of Arts and Sciences, one each from the School of Business, Education and Behavioral Sciences, and the School of Graduate Studies.

GUIDELINES FOR THE PROGRAM SELF-STUDY REPORT

One component of academic program review at Southeastern is the periodic self-study of each program. The purpose of these guidelines is to assist the program faculty in conducting their self-study and to provide some degree of standardization for the self-study report.

Program self-study is structured around six review criteria (standards or "yardsticks" by which a program is measured). The following criteria marked with asterisks are required by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) in their "Policy Statement on Program Review." The OSRHE criteria are: (1) program centrality*, (2) program quality (curriculum, faculty, operations)*, (3) program students and graduates*, (4) program resources, (5) program productivity and cost-effectiveness*, and (6) demand for the program*. These criteria examine the program as it relates to the community external to the institution.

General Instructions and Report Format

The report should be a well-written, readable narrative, not a collection of tables, charts, and graphs. It should be a concise yet thorough summary of the findings of the self-study process and should include three components: (1) factual information about the program, (2) an analysis that identifies program strengths and weaknesses, and (3) recommendations (or plans) for improving the program. The report and recommendations for an individual program **should not exceed** 10-20 double-spaced pages, excluding appendices. Type the report with a 1.5 inch margin on the left, with pages numbered at the bottom center of the page. If tabular data is cited in the report, incorporate condensed tables into the narrative at the place the data are discussed.

Generally, the report should avoid making comparisons with specific programs in other departments. Summary data tables listing several departments (or programs) have been provided to establish a basis for relative assessments; however, any stated comparisons should be based on quartile groups, averages, or ranges. The self-study report will be read by individuals off-campus, and ultimately will be made available to OSRHE. Consequently, the report should be edited so that the writing style is internally consistent, and the report is free from errors (grammatical and typographical).

An electronic copy of the self-study report should be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs by 1 October 2014.

OUTLINE OF SELF-STUDY REPORT

I. PROGRAM CENTRALITY (Compatibility with SOSU Mission)

    A.   Program Mission
    B.   Program Goals - Student Outcomes
    C.   Program Uniqueness*
    D.   Presence of a Planning Process
    E.   Response to Recommendations Made in Previous Evaluation

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

    A.   Curriculum Analysis and Comparisons
    B.   Faculty Qualifications and Activities
    C.   Operations (Class Size, Admission, Advisement, and Enrichment)

III. STUDENTS AND GRADUATES AS QUALITY MEASURES

    A.   Entering Students - Characteristics
    B.   Student Academic Achievement (Assessment)
    C.   Student Perceptions of Program Quality
    D.   Program Graduates – Achievement

IV. PROGRAM RESOURCES

    A.   Finances/Budget
    B.   Facilities and Capital Equipment
    C.   Academic Support Resources and Services

V. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS

    A.   Courses and Student Credit Hours
    B.   Program Completion
    C.   Faculty Productivity
    D.   Program Costs

VI. DEMAND FOR THE PROGRAM

VII. SELF-STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

VIII. APPENDICES

    A.   Faculty Vitae
    B.   Assessment Plan
    C.   Course Syllabi
    D.   Other Materials

It would be most helpful if the report would be organized according to the following outline:

COVER PAGE
Page 1—Table of Contents

Page 2—Roster of Department Chairperson and Program Faculty

> In a separate paragraph indicate the extent and nature of participation of faculty, students, and alumni in the self-study. If department faculty were also involved in developing the report, indicate the nature of their involvement.

The remainder of the report should respond to the evaluation criteria and questions raised in the following sections:

I.   PROGRAM CENTRALITY RELATIVE TO INSTITUTIONAL MISSION*

Program Centrality seeks to establish the degree to which a program is compatible with the mission of an institution. As a review criterion, Program Centrality is best tested by asking the question: "Would the absence of this program require an alteration to the purposes and mission of the institution [1]?

A.   Program Mission**
Provide a concise statement of a few sentences that sketches the history of the program at Southeastern and states the mission (purpose) of the program.

Appraisal Question: Discuss how this program is compatible with the mission of SOSU. Additionally, discuss the role of the program in providing a service function to general education and other degree programs.

B.   Program Curriculum Goals Stated as Student Outcomes*
Provide a list of the goals (aims and expected student outcomes) of the program. These goals should be broad statements that describe the knowledge, cognitive skills, and attitudes (affective domain) that are expected for graduates from the program.

C.   Program Uniqueness*
Appraisal Question: Describe any unique aspects of the program such as subject matter treated, students served, educational methods employed, or significant impact of the program on other institutions or agencies.

**The terms mission, goals, and objectives represent a hierarchy of description which moves from the general to the specific.

D.   <u>Presence of a Planning Process</u>
If your program uses a formal planning process, describe its membership and operation. Otherwise, describe any informal planning activities that have occurred in the department within the past five years.

E.   <u>Response to the Recommendations Made in the Previous Evaluation of the Program</u>
Recommendations for improving the program were made by several parties, including the faculty conducting the self-study, consultant, Organized Research and Program Review Committee, Dean, and Vice-President. Some recommendations were common to all parties, and it would be redundant to list these separately. Hence, <u>combine</u> the common recommendations from the various recommending groups to create a composite statement. In parentheses after the statement denote which groups made the recommendation. Build a numerical list of recommendations. After each recommendation, succinctly describe the department's response since the last evaluation of the program. If additional detail about progress on the recommendation is provided in other sections of self-study report, specify the page where this information is located.

II. PROGRAM QUALITY*

The purposes of review criteria II and III are to identify the outstanding features of a program and ultimately compare the relative standing of the program under review with similar high-quality programs. An operational definition of quality that is offered for consideration is that quality is comparison with a legitimate predetermined standard. The two parts of quality appraisal would be: (1) establishing or acknowledging valid standards, and (2) measuring various aspects of a program against the standards.

This review criterion will examine the curriculum, faculty qualifications and activities, and instructional activities in order to identify additional indicators or measures of program quality.

A.   <u>Curriculum and Instructional Environment</u>
1.   Compare the courses and requirements of this program with equivalent programs at two or more peer institutions. In what way, if any, are the requirements of this program different? What is the rationale for this difference?

2.   If there are established specialty accreditation standards that apply to this program, compare them with the SOSU program. What would be the value to SOSU for this program to be accredited?

3. Please review and comment on the results found in the Program Review Alumni survey regarding program quality are provided in Table I. After reviewing this information, identify the primary strengths and weaknesses of the program from the perspective of alumni.

Faculty Qualifications and Activities

(This section should be completed by the Department Chairperson.) Provide a list of all full-time and part-time *QA* time or greater) faculty and staff directly assigned to the program. In an Appendix provide a complete Curriculum Vita for each faculty member following Southeastern's Curriculum Vita template that can be requested through the Office of Academic Affairs. Be sure that the vita includes formal education (various degrees, institution, dates, and majors), continuing education (specific experience, institution, dates, etc.), relevant experience (industry, business, education), scholarly activities, public service, grants, and publications.

1. Appraisal: Summarize and discuss several measures of faculty quality for the program faculty. Consider degrees, experience, scholarship, student evaluations (SUMMA reports), etc. Identify faculty strengths and faculty-related areas that need improvement to increase the quality of the program. Please review and comment on the results found in the Program Review Faculty survey regarding program quality.

Instruction/Learning/Activities (Operations)

Review and discuss any of the following aspects of program operations that seem to be timely for improving the program.

1. Class size characteristics for the courses offered in this program are provided in Table II. Do you have any recommendations related to class size that you think would improve the quality of the program? Examine Table II to see if freshmen are enrolling in junior- and senior-level courses. If so, what is the explanation for this side mixture of students?

2. Admission standards as related to program objectives.

3. Effectiveness of student advising by the program faculty.

4. Enrichment activities offered by the program. What is the level of participation in these activities?

III. STUDENTS AND GRADUATES AS QUALITY MEASURES*

This review criterion will assess the ability and performance of the program students and graduates and evaluate the effectiveness of the program in achieving its goals.

A.   Student Preparation/Ability/Characteristics
      Appraisal: Provide summary entry-level information about students in the program, such as where they graduated, ACT scores, and high school GPA. Table III is a list of program majors.

B.   Academic Achievement
      Briefly summarize the departmental assessment plan used to measure student academic achievement in your program. Attach the complete plan as an appendix to the self study report.

      Summarize the program assessment results to date, particularly strengths and areas of concern in student performance. If your department uses nationally standardized tests in senior-level courses, major-field exit tests, or professional competency tests, then provide summary data and a discussion about the relative performance of your majors. Do not provide individual tests scores or identify individual students.

      Provide other evidences of academic-related achievement, accomplishments, awards, and honors received by the program majors. List individual students and their specific accomplishments along with explanatory statements that describe their significance. Please remember that all reviewers of the report may not be familiar with the nature of the competition.

      Appraisal Questions: Is student achievement one of the strengths of this program?
      In what aspects is improvement needed to build quality?

      Since the major goal of assessing student academic achievement is curriculum improvement, specifically describe any changes in the program that are a result of assessment activities.

C.   Student Perceptions of Program Quality
      The ETS survey results from current program majors are provided in Table IV for the department to review. This information is primarily self-perceptions about the program.

      Appraisal Question: Please review and comment on the results found in the Program Review Student survey regarding program quality are provided in Table IV. After reviewing this information, identify the primary strengths and weaknesses of the program from the perspective of current students.

D.   Achievement of Program Graduates (Occupational/Post-Graduate Success)*
Some measures that could be used for this indicator are listed below. The department should select one or more of these measures, obtain appropriate data, and review the results to make a judgment about the success of their program graduates.

1.   Number of program graduates placed in the field, graduate programs, professional programs, etc.

2.   Performance of program alumni in graduate or professional programs as measured by GPA, completion of the program, etc.

3.   Employer opinions of the skills and preparation of recent program graduates.

Appraisal Question: Identify and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the program as measured by its graduates.

IV.   PROGRAM RESOURCES

A.   Finances/Budget
Table V shows the SOSU budget allocation and expenditures of this program for the past five years. In addition, list all other sources and amounts of revenue specifically used by this program that are not included in the above.

Appraisal Question: Discuss the adequacy of the budget allocation for accomplishing your program goals.

B.   Facilities and Capital Equipment
Provide a list of the following (1) instructional space including classrooms and laboratories, (2) offices, and (3) equipment. Separate into different categories.

Appraisal: Review and discuss the adequacy and quality of the facilities and capital equipment. What are your projected needs for the next five years? Provide a rationale for this projection. The five-year equipment request plan could be included here.

C.   Academic Support Resources and Services
(Library, media center, computational facilities, laboratories, field experiences, career counseling)

Appraisal: Compare the program support resources and services with high quality situations, or recommended standards of accreditation agencies. Discuss local strengths and weaknesses.

V. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS (Effective Use of Program Resources)

The purpose of this review criterion is to examine the productivity and cost-effectiveness of the program by considering both lower- and upper-division enrollments, and by

comparing the program with similar programs. The OSRHE states that the effective use of resources should be major concern in evaluating programs.

A.   Courses and Student Credit Hours

Review the data presented in Tables II and VI. Does the data seem to be valid, as compared with your experiences? If there are significant differences between lower-and upper-division SCH values, provide a brief explanation. If there are trends over the period of time shown in the table, provide an explanation.

B.   Program Completion

The data presented in Table VII shows the enrollment and graduation of students from the program for the past ten years. Typically, the number of graduates would be about 20-25% of the head-count enrollment or full-year-full-time-equivalent (FYFTE) enrollment. If there is a significant departure from the range of 20-25%, provide an explanation.

C.   Faculty Productivity

Summary instructional load data is provided in Table VIII for the faculty assigned to the department responsible for this program. Table IX provides comparative faculty load data for the past few years for the program relative to the university average. Explain any significant deviations from the University mean values. If faculty loads are excessive, what is being done to insure that program quality does not deteriorate? If faculty loads are significantly lower than the university mean, how does this enable the faculty to develop a quality program?

VI.   DEMAND FOR THE PROGRAM*

The purpose of this criterion would be to determine if there is a demonstrated demand for the program. Demand reflects the desire of the people for what the program has to offer and the needs of individuals and society to be served by the program.

Appraisal: Consider local/regional job market needs, external support of the program, and aspirations that various publics have for this program. Make a brief summary statement to show that there is a demand for this program.

VII. SELF-STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS***

"This section should start with a description of recommendations that are proposed as a result of the review and of actions that are suggested to implement these Recommendations; for example, expand program, maintain program at current level, reduce program in size or scope, merge or consolidate program, reorganize program or terminate program. Recommendations should be clearly linked and supported by the information and analyses that were articulated in the previous sections and should contain a realistic strategy for implementation of any changes. (Cite chapter and page in the report for each recommendation.) For example, if the program is recommended for expansion an allocation of such resources should be included. If the program is recommended for termination: What are the strategies for dealing with personnel matters, with students, with physical resources that will now be free for reallocation to other programs."

"This section of the report also should include, where appropriate, a discussion of such items as anticipated changes in program objectives, organizational realignments, faculty turnover and renewal, changes in curriculum, changes in clientele, changes in support, and possible requests for changes of role and mission statements."

VIII. APPENDIX

A.   Faculty Vitae

B.   Other Materials

***Quoted from Program Review Guidelines of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1985.

COMMENTARY FOR THE SELF-STUDY OF
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The purpose of this commentary is to assist the SOSU faculty in conducting a self-study of an academic program. Explanatory information and additional self-study questions have been provided for some of the evaluative criteria used in self-study. Since formal program self-study is done only once every five years, some of the suggestions in this document may be suitable for interim self-study, or special situations.

Program self-study is normally structured around six review criteria or standards. These criteria are: (1) program centrality, (2) program quality (curriculum, faculty, and operations), (3) program students and graduates, (4) program resources, (5) program productivity and cost-effectiveness, and (6) demand for the program. Four additional criteria included in this commentary are: (7) entry-level characteristics of the students, (8) recruitment, (9) program potential, and (10) retention, persistence, and graduation of program students.

I.   PROGRAM CENTRALITY RELATIVE TO INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

A.   Program Mission*
The mission statement is often used to express the aspirations that society has for programs, schools, or institutions of higher education [1]. It is a statement that reports heritage and enduring purpose or aspiration; as such it describes only the most general focus or direction [2]. An example of a mission statement is: "The mission of XXXX is to meet the need of Southeastern Oklahoma for an educated citizenry, for trained personnel, and for community service."

Optional Self-Study Questions: Where should this program be going in relation to where the institution is going?

Bl. Program Curriculum Goals Stated as Student Outcomes*
Program goals are most useful in program planning, review, self-study, and evaluation when they are written to comply with the recommendations of educational methodology literature. In this literature, a goal is defined as a statement describing a broad or abstract intent, state, or condition. In most situations the goals should describe an educational outcome rather than a process, e.g., the goal should state ends rather than means. An important question to consider in double-checking the statement is: "What does the goal state look like when it is achieved?" If the desired outcomes (skills, knowledge, attitudes) for a program graduate can be articulated, goals can then be stated to match the needed outcomes. Considerable time, effort, and discussion should be devoted to identifying and describing the skills, attributes, and desired performances of a program graduate before developing programmatic goals.

Robert F. Mager [3] has developed a five-step procedure for writing goals and conducting goal analysis. The procedure, which is amply illustrated in his book, consists of the following steps:

(1)   Write down the goal, using whatever words are comfortable, in order to develop an initial draft.

(2)   Jot down, in words and phrases, the performances that, if achieved, would cause you to agree that the goal is achieved.

(3)   Sort out the jottings.   Delete duplications and unwanted items.   Clarify any abstractions and state them as performances.

(4)   Write a complete statement for each performance, describing the nature, quality, or amount you will consider acceptable.

(5)   Test the statements with the questions: If someone achieved or demonstrated each of these performances, would I be willing to say the person has achieved the goal?

Another resource [4] comments that program goals should be stated as specifically as possible so that the public can tell whether they have been achieved. The authors, Morris and Fitz-Gibbon, recognize both end (outcome) goals and means (process) goals. The former describe program outcomes or measurable end products of the program, whereas the latter describe the means for accomplishing the end products. The authors caution that these two types of goals should be separated since the major focus of most evaluation are outcome goals.

Some examples of student-outcomes selected from various sources include:

•   "...the student will be able to plan and execute experiments through the use of chemical literature."

•   "...the program graduate will demonstrate correct grammatical skills in writing reports and correspondence."

•   "...the graduating senior will be able to write programs in two or more computer languages."

•   "...eighty percent of the students shall score above the 50th percentile on the Iowa Test of Educational Development [4]."

*The terms missions, goals, and objectives represent a hierarchy of description which moves from the general to the specific.

Appraisal Question: Describe any changes that have been made in program goals in the past five years. How have these changes helped the program to become more effective?

B2. Department/Faculty Goals for the Program (Optional)
This section might include targets for the recruitment of students, curriculum development, acquisition and replacement of equipment, faculty development, placement of program graduates, etc.

Appraisal Question: Describe how these goals have changed in the past few years. Have these changes impacted upon the compatibility of the program with institutional mission?

Optional Self-Study Activities

1.   Decide if and how program goals should be altered to take into account changes in the institution's environment, and changes in the program's environment within the institution.

2.   This is an opportunity to question (examine) the fundamental assumptions upon which the program is based. Questions of value should also be asked; such as the importance of goals as they relate to the needs and aspirations of students, the university, and society. Some authors have indicated that program goals are an outgrowth of beliefs, values, and philosophy. Hence, an examination of the educational/professional philosophy, values, and beliefs may be fruitful for identifying important program goals.

3.   Review whether valid measures are being used to determine if program goals are being reached.

4.   A needs-assessment questionnaire for employers of the program graduates would also be appropriate. The questionnaire could help identify needed skills and attitudes that the graduates should possess, etc.

B3. Program Objectives* (Optional)
If the program has clearly defined goals, the second phase of refinement would be

to state one or more companion objectives that provide more detail for achieving the goal.

Descriptive: Provide statements of the specific objectives that have been developed for this program, and indicate the goal with which each is associated.

Objectives are specific ends to be achieved with regard to a particular goal. Sometimes several objectives are written to amplify the meaning of a particular goal. Objectives should be stated in quantitative terms, and connote intent that courses of action will be undertaken to attain them. A well-stated objective typically includes the following elements: (1) a specification of the intended audience to be directly affected by the objective; (2) a specification of the criteria on which assessment of the degree of accomplishment will be based; and (3) a specification of the measure or kind of evidence to be used in this assessment [3]. Examples of objectives include: (1) "To enroll a freshman class having the same racial and economics characteristics as the high school graduates in the geographical area served by the institution." (2) "To place at least 70 percent of the program graduates in jobs for which they are trained within the geographical area served by the institution."

Optional Self-Study Activities

1.   Describe any major changes in program objectives over the past five years.

2.   State how contacts and communication with employers of the program graduates stimulated any changes in the program objectives.

C.   Program Uniqueness*
     The purpose of this criterion is to review selected aspects of the program in order to identify its unique (special) characteristics that make it especially valuable to society. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Policy for Program Review states that "A program can be unique because of the subject matter treated, the students served, the educational methods employed, and the effect of the achievements of the program on other institutions or agencies. Such programs may be maintained at an institution even though high costs and/or low enrollments are experienced if acceptable justifications are made."

     Duplication With Other Programs: Provide a list of similar programs in the region and the approximate enrollment in each program. Also, provide a list of equivalent courses in this program that are taught in other SOSU departments. As an example, why should each discipline have its own statistics course?

     Appraisal Question: Provide a rationale that justifies the SOSU Program and similar programs in the region.

D.   Presence of a Planning Process
     Appraisal: (1) Does the planning process include representatives of constituents such as students, faculty, employers, and potential employers?

(2) What evidences are available to suggest that the program has plans to remain compatible with the future institutional mission?

(3) In what way(s) has the planning process contributed to the viability of the program?

(4) Has input from planning contributed to changes in program goals and objectives?

II. PROGRAM QUALITY (Curriculum, Faculty, and Operations)*

A. Curriculum and Instruction Environment
1. Examine the possible course taking sequences and patterns for this program. Look for short cuts, easy ways through the program, etc. Provide specific information about the various sequences that can be selected. How do these possible sequences actually compare with the historical data represented by students records?

2. Examine the course and program descriptions, and catalog description. Do these descriptions communicate clearly? What evidence do you have to verify the clarity of communications?

3. The SUMMA reports (student evaluation of instruction) could be used to draw some conclusions about the overall instruction in this program.

B. Faculty Qualifications and Activities
Appraisal: Summarize and discuss several of the following measures of faculty quality for those individuals that teach in the program. Also identify faculty strengths, and faculty-related areas that need improvement in order to increase the quality of the program.

1. Degree levels and other training of full-time faculty. Be specific.

2. Years teaching experience of the full-time faculty. Be specific.

3. Proportion of program courses taught by part-time faculty (provide specific information).

4. Evidences of faculty scholarship such as:

a. External support for research or other scholarly activities.

       b.   publications and other evidences of creative productivity

       c.   external recognition (exhibits, commissions, awards, lectureships, seminars, advisory appointments, consulting, review panels, and professional activities).

5.   Faculty potential for growth in scholarship. Be specific.

6.   Faculty development experiences and renewal plans. Be specific for <u>each</u> faculty member involved in the program.

7.   Anticipated faculty turnovers and potential for new appointment opportunities.

8.   Faculty workload patterns and classroom skills.

9.   The SUMMA reports or other student evaluations of instruction could be used to provide evidence of faculty quality.

C.   <u>Instruction/Learning/Activities (Operations)</u>
Review any of the following aspects of program operations that seem to be timely for improving the program.

1.   Examine the effectiveness of student advising by the program faculty. What are the course withdrawal patterns, if any. Examine student perceptions of advisement effectiveness.

2.   Survey entering students to gain insight about the image your program conveys to prospective consumers.

3.   To what extent have your program faculty discussed and examined basic questions about instructional technology? To what extent have you sought to improve on teaching of the subject matter and its associated skills?

III. PROGRAM QUALITY (Students and Graduates)

<u>Academic Achievement</u>

To expedite review in this area SOSU probably should administer one or more cognitive-skills tests on an institution-wide basis. These could be administered at the end of the sophomore year, or at the time of graduation. The specific kinds of exams would be selected later. Another measure of achievement would be mean GPA for students in the programs by academic level versus SOSU as a whole. A table should be included to show cognitive-skills test results for the department to review.

Meanwhile, those departments using nationally standardized tests in senior-level courses, State Certification Tests (Teacher Education Programs), or Professional Competency Tests are urged to supply data and provide a discussion about the relative performance of their majors.

Achievement of Program Graduates (Occupational/Post-Graduate Success)

1. Proportion of program completers/leavers placed in the field, graduate programs, professional programs, etc.

    This measure would require that SOSU and the Departments be persistent in the follow-up of their graduates. One way to proceed initially would be for the department to request a list of program graduates for the previous year from the Registrar's Office, then do a survey to ascertain their post-program activities. Provide a representative list of recent alumni, indicate their current status, and achievements since leaving SOSU.

2. Performance of program alumni in graduate or professional programs as measured by GPA, completion of the program, etc.

    The individual would most likely have to provide this information to SOSU on a voluntary basis.

3. Employer opinions of the skills and preparation of recent program graduates.

The legal ramifications of this measure would need to be reviewed. If used, the individual may need to sign a release form, giving SOSU permission to contact the employer. Teacher education programs use a follow-up survey that obtains general employer perceptions.

    Appraisal Question: Identify and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the program as measured by its graduates.

IV.   PROGRAM RESOURCES

The purpose of this criterion is to review the resources used to support the program, confirm their accuracy, and ultimately consider program effectiveness and efficiency in the use of these resources.

Finances/Budget

Comparative evaluation: Compare with similar programs at peer institutions.

Facilities and Capital Equipment

Academic Support Resources and Services
(Library, media center, computational facilities, laboratories, field experiences, career counseling)

V. PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS
(Effective Use of Program Resources)

Student Enrollment and Service to Other Programs

Obtain data and construct a table to show the annual student credit hours (SCHs) provided by this program for its own majors, and as requirements for other programs. Consider the annual SCHs provided as electives for students in other programs.

Appraisal Questions: In which direction do you anticipate this data will change in the future, assuming SOSU will maintain constant enrollment? What are your reasons if you envision an increase or decrease in service to other programs?

Discuss the service instruction provided to other programs by the faculty of this program. What are the total SCHs per semester, and what percentage is service instruction?

VI. PROGRAM NEED AND DEMAND*

The purpose of this criterion would be to determine if there is a demonstrated need for the program, as indicated by societal needs and students' demands.

Local/Regional Job Market Needs

What kinds of surveys have been done to estimate existing and projected job openings for graduates from this program. Also, what percentage of the area employers have expressed a need for graduates from this type of program.

External Support of Program

Discuss the support shown by external groups for the program. For example, what kind and quality of participation is shown by external representatives in program advisory meetings? In what other ways do regional employers contribute to the program? Review and discuss community support for the program. In what ways do other academic institutions demonstrate support for the program, and what percentage of credits offered by this program are accepted at other institutions?

Success in Meeting Student Needs/Demands

Review and discuss the degree of satisfaction that has been expressed for the program by the completers and leavers.

VII. STUDENTS: ENTRY-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS
(Optional-Not required by OSRHE)

The purpose of this review criterion is to provide a profile of the characteristics and abilities of students entering the program. Consideration of this criterion can enhance the understanding of program faculty about the skills and abilities of the students in the program.

Student Demographics

Provide summary demographic data for the students in the programs, such as sex, age, ethnicity, and classification.

Appraisal: Review and discuss any features or insights provided by the data. Are there implications for possibly improving the program? Also, look for significant differences between students in this program and other programs.

Student Preparation/Ability

Provide summary entry-level information about students in the program such as ACT scores and high school GPA.

Appraisal: Review the data and discuss any significant differences between students entering the program under review and students enrolling in other programs. Does the instructional methodology used in this program take into account any differences?

Student Activity Levels

Provide a summary of student enrollment, hours enrolled in the major, and hours completed for students in the program.

Appraisal: Examine this data for insights and trends. Are students loads in the program comparable with other programs in your school? What is the highest degree planned by students enrolled in the program? What is the primary reason students give for enrolling in the program? What approach have you used to gather this information?

VIII. RECRUITMENT (Optional - Not Required by OSRHE)

The purpose of this review criterion is to assess the success of the program in identifying and attracting an appropriate student body. This optional criterion would be used when a program

wants to examine ways to improve its recruitment efforts. Alternately, the Program Review Panel could assign the criterion when a program needs to have additional students to make it more cost-effective.

Activities, recruitment materials, and recruitment methodologies of the program faculty and other offices that recruit specifically for the program will be described and reviewed. Assess the match (correlation) between recruitment efforts and identified needs and characteristics of potential students. The latter is usually obtained from needs assessments and market surveys.

Compare the program's practices and materials with comparable program at other institutions.

A formal part of the review might include interviews or surveys of area high school guidance counselors and pertinent teachers to obtain data on their perceptions and level of information about the program.

IX. PROGRAM POTENTIAL (Optional - Not required by OSRHE)

The purpose of this criterion is to predict the future potential of the program, and to identify programs that should be labeled for focused development.

Consider the prospects and potential of the program as judged by appropriate people: (1) faculty and the director, (2) faculty in related areas, (3) outside experts, and (4) state and national projections. Formal evidence such as written testimony and position papers should be provided.

Consider the quality of leadership and intellectual life of the program as judged by: (1) faculty and students in the program, (2) others on campus, and (3) outside experts. Provide appropriate evidence and written testimony to document the review.

Consider the program objectives in the context of changes within the discipline(s). Provide supporting documentation that the objectives are appropriate. Describe anticipated changes in the discipline(s) and indicate approaches that will be used to maintain program viability.

X. RETENTION, PERSISTENCE, AND GRADUATION OF PROGRAM STUDENTS

Obtain data to examine the attrition of program majors. The IRP Office has information on freshmen for several years.

Appraisal Question: Review the attrition data in the tables and discuss whether your department needs to study the causes of attrition from this program. State the rationale for your decision.

REFERENCES

1. Fenske, Robert H., Chapter 9, "Setting Institutional Goals and Objectives," Improving Academic Management: A Handbook Of Planning and Institutional Research: Editor, P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, and Associates, pp. 177-199, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

2. Romney, Leonard C. and Gerald K. Bogen, "Assessing Institutional Goals: Proceed With Caution," in Using Goals in Research and Planning: Editor, Robert H. Fenske, pp. 17-30, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1978.

3. Mager, Robert F., "Goal Analysis," Belmont, CA, Fearon Publishers, 1972.

4. Morris, Lynn and Carol Fitz-Gibbon, How to Deal With Goals and Objectives, pp. 13-47; Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1978.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arns, Robert G. and William Poland, "Changing the University through Program Review," Journal of Higher Education. 51. 269 - 284, (1980).

Russo, J. Robert, David G. Brown, and James G. Rothweiler, "A Model for Internal Program Review," College and University. 52. 288 - 298 (Spring 1977).

Craven, Eugene, "Evaluating Program Performance," in Improving Academic Management, edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, Chapter 22, (1980).

Program Review Guidelines. St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, FL, From Dr. Roy A. Church.

Program Review in Higher Education: Within and Without. Robert J. Barak, NCHEMS Publications, Boulder, CO (1982).

IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS

This phase of program review consists of several steps that obtain the collective input of several parties. Hopefully, these steps will build on the collective wisdom of several perspectives while providing several checks and balances within this phase of program review.

1.   The names of prospective consultants are solicited from the faculty in the pertinent academic department and from academic administrators. In addition, the IRP Office will request the names of prospective consultants from contacts at peer institutions in contiguous states.

2.   Resumes are requested from all prospective consultants by the IRP Office.

3.   The Organized Research and Program Review Committee will initially review the resumes and rate each prospective consultant in terms of the appropriateness of his/her credentials.

4.   The vice-president and dean will examine the credentials of each prospective consultant and select one or more finalists to invite to SOSU.

5.   The resume of each finalist is submitted to the academic department for consideration. If there are no objections, the IRP Office will then make the arrangements to invite one of the finalists to Southeastern.

Criteria for Selecting Consultants

1.   Doctorate if Possible

2.   Credentials as Scholar and Teacher; Currency in the Discipline

3.   Understanding of Regional State Universities and Their Environment

4.   Understanding of Academics and has Administrative Perspective
     (Leadership)

5.   Evidence of a National Reputation in His/Her Field

6.   Program Evaluation Experience, if possible

     Rate all Consultants -if it is too difficult, leave the top three-four candidates unranked.

GUIDELINES FOR SCREENING PROSPECTIVE CONSULTANTS*

1. Please rank each candidate based on the criteria listed below. The rating scale will be:

   0- no evidence of the criterion being met
   1- limited evidence of the criterion being met
   2- average experience in the criterion
   3- good experience in the criterion
   4- outstanding

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING CONSULTANTS

1. Doctorate if Possible

2. Credentials as Scholar and Teacher; Currency in the Discipline

3. Understanding of Regional State Universities and Their Environment

4. Understanding of Academics and has Administrative Perspective (Leadership)

5. Evidence of a National Reputation in His/Her Field

6. Program Evaluation Experience, if possible

2. After completing the Screening Form, please list your first, second, and third choice in the space provided at the bottom of the form. If your selection is different from the "Total Points" selection, please give a brief rationale, should it be difficult to order your top three, please write "Tie" next to their names if they appear to be equal in their qualifications. The dean of the appropriate school and the Assistant vice President for Academic Affairs will also review the finalists. It will be appropriate to submit two or more finalists to the department for a final choice (encourage 3-4 finalists).

* The rating scale and attached form were developed in 1991 -92 by the Organized Research and Program Review Committee, chaired by Dr. Paula Platter. The contributions of Dr. Elizabeth Walters is acknowledged   in developing the rating scale

NAME OF PROGRAM

Candidate	Doctorate	Credentials as Scholar and Teacher; Currency in the Discipline	Understanding of Regional Universities and their Environment (Collaborating Experience should be Current)	Understanding of Academics and Possesses Administrative Perspective	Experience in Evaluation	Evidence of National Reputation	Total Points

1st Choice:

2nd Choice:

3rd Choice:

GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSULTANT'S REPORT

The major goal of program review at Southeastern is to improve the academic programs offered by the institution. An important aspect of the evaluation process is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program with respect to curriculum, faculty, students, facilities, and operational procedures.

The Southeastern catalog and program self-study report will introduce the peer-reviewer to the program. As the program is reviewed, the consultant should compare it with similar programs at medium-sized regional state universities.

The following information is requested in the evaluation report.

I.   Provide a brief description of the program at Southeastern, as perceived by the consultant.

 II.   Appraisal of Program Components.

Critique each of the following program elements/components in terms of their relative strengths and weaknesses. Also, note any unusual difference in the SOSU Program.

1.   Program goals and objectives (specificity, clarity, and appropriateness) ~ Are they stated as Student Outcomes/Skills?

2.   Compatibility of this program with the mission of SOSU.   (The SOSU mission statement is provided on pages 2-3 of the catalog.)

3.   Curriculum (breadth, depth, requirements, course sequence, etc.).

4.   Faculty (educational qualifications, appropriate experience, scholarship and self-renewal, workload, <u>initiative,</u> and morale).

5a.   Operational procedures and program processes.

5b.   Departmental coordination and faculty involvement in the program management.

6.   Students (abilities, attrition, attitudes, academic achievement, other accomplishments, and post-graduate success). Also, critique the Assessment Plan developed for the Program.

7.   Resources (financial support, library, and other academic support services, etc.).

8.   Facilities (classrooms, laboratories, offices, equipment, etc.).

9.   Relative program costs and effective use of resources provided to the program.

10.   Administrative/Institutional support of the program.

11.   Other Factors: size of classes, total enrollment in program, number of graduates.

III. Overall Program Quality Rating

Provide an overall rating of this program relative to other similar programs with which you are acquainted. Use a specific rating which covers the range of: Acceptable (lowest rating), Fair, Adequate, Satisfactory (medium or average), Good, Excellent, and Outstanding (highest possible rating). Briefly state the rationale for your rating.

IV. Recommendations

In numerical order briefly state each recommendation from the Self-Study Report. Then state whether you concur, give qualified agreement or disagree with the recommendation. In addition, you may wish to provide a brief rationale or discussion.

Provide any additional recommendations for improving the program. Assume that only limited funds would be available in the next 3-5 years for reallocation to this program. Hence, you may want to provide two categories of recommendations: (1) those that can be implemented without a substantial input of dollars, and (2) those that require substantial allocations.