1.0 INTRODUCTION

Saint Louis University strives to provide high quality programs to its constituency and is committed to the periodic and ongoing evaluation of those programs. This policy establishes a program review process to ensure that programs not held to external accreditation standards engage in the same level of programmatic review as those subject to external accreditation.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that all programs at Saint Louis University undergo periodic review to ensure their quality, including those that are not reviewed through an external accreditation process.

3.0 PERSONNEL AFFECTED

Deans, Chairpersons, Directors, faculty, and staff of all academic programs at Saint Louis University.

4.0 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The following is the University’s glossary of terms that provide a consistent framework from which to discuss program reviews. They are to be shared and used throughout the institution.

Assessment: includes the collection and analysis of data with the intent to strengthen and enhance the delivery of educational programs, particularly in the areas of student learning outcomes.

Assessment for accountability: assessment of some unit (could be a department, program or entire institution) to satisfy stakeholders external to the unit itself. Results are often compared across units. Always summative. Example: to retain state approval, the
achievement of a 90 percent pass rate or better on teacher certification tests by graduates of a school of education.

Assessment of individuals: uses the individual student, and his/her learning, as the level of analysis. Can be quantitative or qualitative, formative or summative, standards-based or value added, and used for improvement. Would need to be aggregated if used for accountability purposes. Examples: improvement in student knowledge of a subject during a single course; improved ability of a student to build cogent arguments over the course of an undergraduate career.

Assessment of programs: uses the department or program as the level of analysis. Can be quantitative or qualitative, formative or summative, standards-based or value added, and used for improvement or for accountability. Ideally program goals and objectives would serve as a basis for the assessment. Example: how sophisticated a close reading of texts senior English majors can accomplish (if used to determine value added, would be compared to the ability of newly declared majors).

Assessment of institutions: uses the institution as the level of analysis. Can be quantitative or qualitative, formative or summative, standards-based or value added, and used for improvement or for accountability. Ideally, institution-wide goals and objectives would serve as a basis for the assessment. Example: how well students across the institution can work in multi-cultural teams as sophomores and seniors.

Assessment for improvement: assessment that feeds directly, and often immediately, back into revising the course, program or institution to improve student learning results. Can be formative or summative (see "formative assessment" for an example).

Direct assessment of learning: gathers evidence, based on student performance, which demonstrates the learning itself. Can be value added, related to standards, qualitative or quantitative, embedded or not, using local or external criteria. Examples: most classroom testing for grades is direct assessment (in this instance within the confines of a course), as is the evaluation of a research paper in terms of the discriminating use of sources. The latter example could assess learning accomplished within a single course or, if part of a senior requirement, could also assess cumulative learning.

Direct Measure of Learning Outcome: development of outcomes specifically focused on learning achieved by students.

Educational Objectives: include the knowledge, skills, capacities, attitudes or dispositions students are expected to acquire as a result of completing your academic program. Objectives are sometimes treated as synonymous with outcomes, though outcomes are usually more detailed, behavioral in nature, and stated in precise operational terms (see Learning Outcomes).

Embedded assessment: a means of gathering information about student learning that is built into and a natural part of the teaching-learning process. Often used for assessment
purposes classroom assignments that are evaluated to assign students a grade. Can assess individual student performance or aggregate the information to provide information about the course or program; can be formative or summative, quantitative or qualitative. Example: as part of a course, expecting each senior to complete a research paper that is graded for content and style, but is also assessed for advanced ability to locate and evaluate Web-based information (as part of a college-wide outcome to demonstrate information literacy).

**Evaluation:** The use of assessment findings (evidence/data) to judge program effectiveness; used as a basis for making decisions about program changes or improvement.

**External assessment:** use of criteria (rubric) or an instrument developed by an individual or organization external to the one being assessed. Usually summative, quantitative, and often high-stakes (see below). Example: GRE exams.

**Formative Assessment:** the gathering of information about student learning-during the progression of a course or program and usually repeatedly-to improve the learning of those students. Example: reading the first lab reports of a class to assess whether some or all students in the group need a lesson on how to make them succinct and informative.

**Goals:** are the general aims or purposes of a program and its curriculum. Effective goals are broadly stated, meaningful, achievable and assessable. Goals provide a framework for determining the more specific educational objectives of a program, and should be consistent with program and institutional mission.

"**High stakes**" use of assessment: the decision to use the results of assessment to set a hurdle that needs to be cleared for completing a program of study, receiving certification, or moving to the next level. Most often the assessment so used is externally developed, based on set standards, carried out in a secure testing situation, and administered at a single point in time. Examples: at the secondary school level, statewide exams required for graduation; in postgraduate education, the bar exam.

**Indirect Measure of Learning Outcome:** Students or others report their perception of how well a given learning outcome has been achieved.

**Indirect assessment of learning:** gathers reflection about the learning or secondary evidence of its existence. Example: a student survey about whether a course or program helped develop a greater sensitivity to issues of diversity.

**Learning Outcomes:** Operational statements describing specific student behaviors that evidence the acquisition of desired knowledge, skills, abilities, capacities, attitudes or dispositions. Learning outcomes can be usefully thought of as behavioral criteria for determining whether students are achieving the educational objectives of a program, and, ultimately, whether overall program goals are being successfully met. Outcomes are sometimes treated as synonymous with objectives, though objectives are usually more
general statements of what students are expected to achieve in an academic program (see Educational Objectives).

**Local assessment:** means and methods that are developed by an institution's faculty based on their teaching approaches, students, and learning goals. Can fall into any of the definitions here except "external assessment," for which is it an antonym. Example: one college's use of nursing students' writing about the "universal precautions" at multiple points in their undergraduate program as an assessment of the development of writing competence.

**Qualitative assessment:** collects data that does not lend itself to quantitative methods but rather to interpretive criteria (see the first example under "standards").

**Quantitative assessment:** collects data that can be analyzed using quantitative methods (see "assessment for accountability" for an example).

**Standards:** sets a level of accomplishment all students are expected to meet or exceed. Standards do not necessarily imply high quality learning; sometimes the level is a lowest common denominator. Nor do they imply complete standardization in a program; a common minimum level could be achieved by multiple pathways and demonstrated in various ways. Examples: carrying on a conversation about daily activities in a foreign language using correct grammar and comprehensible pronunciation; achieving a certain score on a standardized test.

**Summative Assessment:** the gathering of information at the conclusion of a course, program, or undergraduate career to improve learning or to meet accountability demands. When used for improvement, impacts the next cohort of students taking the course or program. Examples: examining student final exams in a course to see if certain specific areas of the curriculum were understood less well than others; analyzing senior projects for the ability to integrate across disciplines.

**Triangulation:** involves the collection of data via multiple methods in order to determine if the results show a consistent outcome.

**Value added:** the increase in learning that occurs during a course, program, or undergraduate education. Can either focus on the individual student (how much better a student can write, for example, at the end than at the beginning) or on a cohort of students (whether senior papers demonstrate more sophisticated writing skills-in the aggregate-than freshmen papers). Requires a baseline measurement for comparison.
5.0 POLICY

Quality assurance is a hallmark of higher education. Thorough, systematic review of degree programs provides evidence that they are intrinsically educational and economically viable. This policy establishes a program review process for all academic programs at Saint Louis University.

Departments and programs that reside within units that are externally accredited, but are not themselves accredited, are also required to participate in the Program Review Process. Academic programs that are accredited by an external accrediting organization are asked to complete a review of the Saint Louis University Program Review criteria to determine if there are areas that are not included in the self-study compiled for the external accrediting organization. Such programs are required to complete a two-to-five page summary addressing those items that are included in this policy that were not included in the external self-study with particular emphasis on programmatic needs and program, school or college and institutional steps to be taken. The program review process should be congruent with established unit, college/school and university goals.

Program review input to the department, the Dean(s) and the Provost to:
- establish unit, college/school and university goals;
- inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions;
- monitor the University’s performance vis-à-vis national and international trends;
- make necessary resource allocations, retractions or other program changes;
- provide information to academic administration, the Board of Trustees, and accreditation agencies.

A detailed, systematic program review also provides the vehicle for:
- periodic analysis of the extent to which degree programs provide students with a high quality education and preparation to participate in the global society;
- documentation of how degree programs are achieving stated student learning outcomes and program objectives within the context of the institution’s mission (i.e. what is done well);
- a focus on the assessment of student learning outcomes and continuous program improvement (i.e. what might need to be done differently, and why);
- review of departmental and program mission(s) and purpose(s) within the context of the institutional mission;
- the establishment of teaching, research, service, and other program goals and objectives, including expected outputs and outcomes, especially in the area of student learning (i.e. how will continuous improvement be accomplished, and how will that be measured);
- assessment of:
  - resources and support services
  - how well program goals are being met
  - how well students are achieving expected student learning outcomes
  - how the results of these assessments are used for continuous program improvement.
6.0 PROCEDURES

6.1 Overview. Saint Louis University will use the following procedures to conduct periodic evaluations of its departments and programs that do not participate in an external accreditation review process (whenever used alone in the discussion below, the term "department" refers to both departments and programs). The frequency and scheduling of the reviews will be determined by the Dean.

1. A faculty committee, under the leadership of the specific department chair or program director, prepares a draft of a self-study document. The academic unit has primary responsibility for the development and production of the self-study report. The departmental self-study team includes the department chair or designee and one or more senior faculty members of the department. The team is selected or elected according to the established governance process of the department or program. Once the department has selected or elected its committee, the dean must approve the proposed membership.

2. After inviting other department faculty to respond to the self-study draft, the faculty committee prepares a final version of its self-study. This final version is then forwarded to the Associate Dean (who is responsible for program review). The associate dean reviews the self-study for completeness, and then forwards the complete self-study to the Dean.

3. The Dean appoints external reviewers to evaluate the department and its self-study using the process described in Section II B. Using the format and process described within these guidelines, the external reviewers conduct their evaluations, write their reports, and deliver these reports to the Dean and the Dean of the Graduate School, if graduate programs are involved. The report is also delivered to the chair of the department being evaluated, who will share it with the department's faculty.

4. The Dean initiates and oversees the responses and follow-up action plans, both short- and long-range with the implementation being facilitated by the academic unit. Upon completion of the responses and development of the action plans, the academic unit will forward the document to the Dean.

5. The Dean forwards the self-study, external reports, any department responses, and his or her own response and recommendations to the Provost.

6. The Provost meets with the Dean, the Graduate Dean (if appropriate), and the Department Chair or Program Director to discuss the evaluation and its recommendations.

6.2 Self-Study. The self-study is part of a program review process that focuses on program performance, continuous program improvement, the identification of problems and solutions, and evidence of student learning outcomes. The self-study
presents both an analysis and a description of the total academic program and its future.

The self-study should present the current status of departmental programs based on the unit’s activities and achievements. It should identify strengths and weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, student quality, teaching quality and assessment, scholarship, resources and a review of budgetary and financial considerations. The self-study must present accurate information and statistical data from which evidence-based planning and goals are established. It should identify plans for improvement and new initiatives. The self-study is most useful when areas for improvement, accomplishments, and plans are analyzed honestly and fairly. Thus, it should be thorough, clear, and concise, constructive, candid, introspective, and analytical. It should also credibly assess the status and future of the department or program and focus on challenges, aspirations, and goals. Evaluative strategies may include student and/or alumni focus groups and on-line surveys.

The document should not exceed twenty pages, not including the appendices and vitae, and must follow the outline contained in Appendix A. The department chair or program director will contact the unit’s faculty librarian liaison at least two weeks in advance of the final self-study report. The liaison will complete a collection development analysis report that will be appended to the self-study.

The Dean will determine the structure and composition of a committee to develop the self-study.

6.3.1 Overview: External Review of Departments and Programs. The second element of the Program Review process is the external review. During this stage, the Dean or her/his designee engages consultants (external to the University) and/or uses a recent specialized accreditation report, if approved by the Dean. The external consultants are asked to review, analyze, and write recommendations based on the program's self-study report and a campus visit.

The external review should bring an objective perspective to the program review process and is intended to present an outsider's view of the program's quality and the accuracy of the self-study. This external review should offer information regarding whether the self-study document properly reflects the program components, the importance of external environmental trends, and the statements made about the profession as a whole. It should offer opportunities to suggest new and innovative program enhancement ideas, teaching methodologies, and organizational structures. The recommendations resulting from the external review process should be of the quality that would be considered influential in decisions about future directions of the program.

6.3.2 Nomination of External Reviewers. The nomination process begins with the program faculty, as they are in the best position to suggest qualified consultants. Faculty know the field, the national experts, and the comparable degree programs.
The department under review nominates at least three to five external consultants for the dean's selection. Depending on the size and complexity of the program, the dean will decide on the final number of external consultants who will participate in the review.

Supporting documentation for the nominations provided by the department should include the curriculum vitae of the potential consultants, a cover letter supporting the nominations from the department, and confirmation of the willingness of each of the nominees to serve as consultants. The letter should specify the rank order of the nominees and contain summary information concerning each nominee's qualifications. This summary should highlight the strengths that each nominee brings to improving the program, based on the following criteria for the selection of external consultants.

- The highest degree in the relevant discipline and the rank of associate professor or higher;
- Distinguished record in related research, teaching, and service;
- A national reputation in the field, as evidenced by published research and participation in national organizations in such roles as an officer or editorial board of major journals;
- No existing conflicts of interest, such as being a prospective candidate for a position at Saint Louis University;
- Ability to undertake a site visit within the necessary time frame;
- Experience with program review, institutional effectiveness, or accreditation;
- Experience at an institution with the same/similar programs as those being evaluated;
- Be from a Saint Louis University benchmark institution, or a Doctoral / Research-Extensive University, or from a nationally-ranked program which is emulated by the Saint Louis University department.

The dean communicates the selection of consultants to the Department, the consultants, and the individuals who may not have been chosen to provide the review services.

6.3.3 Charge to External Consultant. The Dean’s letter of invitation must charge the external consultant with responsibility for determining:

- To what extent the department is achieving its vision, mission, goals, and objectives;
- A detailed analysis of the unit’s ability to meet emerging needs in the field;
- A detailed analysis of discipline-specific accomplishments and challenges.

The letter should likewise include materials as specified in the “External Reviewers’ Pre-Visit Checklist” found in Appendix B and a copy of “Suggested Questions for External Reviewers” found in Appendix C. Though no specific format is required for the final report, the External Reviews should nonetheless be provided with the outline contained in Section 6.3.7.

6.3.4 Travel Arrangements and Budget. The Provost's office will pay the first $5,000 of the consultants’ honoraria and documented accommodation and travel costs. The academic unit and Dean's Office serve as hosts for the reviewers throughout the site visit, and the dean’s office pays any remaining costs.

The Dean's Office also coordinates the travel arrangements with the consultant, orders airline tickets, and makes hotel reservations. The external consultant is normally contracted for two days of consultation and one day to write the report.

6.3.5 External Reviewers’ Visit Schedule. The site visitors should be provided with all the materials listed in the "External Reviewers' Pre-Visit Checklist" (Appendix B) at least four weeks prior to the actual visit. S/he should likewise be provided with a schedule of activities in advance (please see a sample site visit schedule contained in Appendix D).

The site visit will be held over two days normally, either a Monday/Tuesday or a Thursday/Friday. It begins with a 60-minute initial meeting of the external reviewers, the Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the school or college, the Dean of the Graduate School (if graduate programs are included in the evaluation), the Chairperson of the Department, (or Program Director, if appropriate), and the Associate Dean of the academic unit charged with program review, and a member of the College's Executive Advisory Board. The purpose of this initial meeting is to discuss the university, college, and department's missions, goals, and objectives, as well as any general or specific expectations and/or direction for the site visit report.

The schedule for the site visit will include a tour of physical facilities, meetings with all faculty, and a representative sample of both undergraduates and graduate (where appropriate) students, alumni, and other university offices if requested (e.g. admissions, libraries, etc.). A 60-minute exit interview will be conducted in the late afternoon of the second day of the site visit with the external reviewers, the Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean, the Dean of the Graduate School (if graduate programs are included in the evaluation), the Chairperson of the Department, (or Program Director, if appropriate), and the Associate Dean charged with program review. This meeting will be held to provide an initial summary of the reviewers' findings, clarify any and review any initial recommendations.
6.3.6 Site Visit Report. The external reviewers should submit a formal, written report within 45 days of the site visit. There is no specific format for the report, and the content and length of the report will vary based on the nature and size of the academic unit. However, the external reviewers are requested to address the following substantive areas as they relate to undergraduate and, if appropriate, graduate programs.

1. **Mission and goals.** Does the academic unit have clearly stated mission and goals and are there appropriate mechanisms and procedures to evaluate the attainment of the mission and goals? Does the academic unit contribute significantly to the university and college’s mission and strategic plan? Does the academic unit advance the discipline and profession relative to peer institutions? Does the academic unit address the five dimensions of the Saint Louis University experience?

2. **Strategic initiatives and future directions.** What are the strategic initiatives and future directions of the academic unit and are they consistent with national trends, current peer institutions and aspirational peer institutions?

3. **Learning objectives and curriculum.** Are there clearly articulated learning objectives, educational outcomes, curricular content and sequence? Does the academic unit have adequate processes and procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of their learning objectives and outcomes? Are areas of program focus (e.g., concentrations, tracks, certifications) consistent with national or international trends and do they have sufficient human and physical resources?

4. **Student recruitment, retention and placement.** Are the program’s recruitment efforts and strategies adequate to sustain currently or provide growth in the future? Is there adequate diversity of the student body within the academic unit? What are the efforts of the academic unit to address student diversity, retention, graduation, career advisement and placement?

5. **Faculty.** How do faculty research, scholarly activity and external funding compare to those of other peer and aspirational peer institutions? Are there sufficient number and quality of faculty to achieve the mission, goals and objectives of the program? Are faculty research and scholarly activities integrated into student learning?

6. **Resources and support facilities.** Does the program have the necessary physical resources (e.g., classrooms, laboratories, office space, etc.), educational resources (e.g., advising, library, technology, etc.), and human resources (e.g., secretarial, information technology, etc.) to achieve its goals and objectives? What additional resources would be needed for future growth?

7. **Service.** Does the academic unit collaborate with or impact the surrounding St. Louis community? Are there opportunities for enhancing involvement and contributions to the community?

8. **Future initiatives.** Does the academic unit have any proposed areas for growth or enhancement, including new degree or certificate programs? What are the potential advantages and disadvantages for implementing such initiatives and what resources would be needed for success?
9. **Conclusions and recommendations.** What are the strengths of the academic unit? What are the academic unit’s challenges and weaknesses? What areas need the most improvement? What areas provide the greatest opportunities for growth? What actions and resources would be needed to effectively grow the program?

**Distribution and Response to the Site Visit Report.** The site visit report will be distributed to the Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean, if the unit has a graduate program, the Graduate Dean, and the Chair or Director of the academic unit or program. The Chair or Director will share the report with the unit’s faculty and obtain faculty reactions, comments and suggestions regarding the report. Any inaccuracies or misstatements in the report should be clarified. The academic unit should comment on and address any recommendations in the report, and indicate whether a recommendation should be supported or not supported, and provide rationale for the response. The academic unit’s response to the site visit report should be in writing and distributed to the Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean, and if the unit has a graduate program, the Dean of the Graduate School. The response should include a plan and timeline for addressing the recommendations, as appropriate.

**APPROVAL SIGNATURES**

This policy was approved by:

Joe Weixlmann, Ph.D.
Provost
Saint Louis University
APPENDIX A
Self-Study Topical Outline

Cover Page: Use the standard Program Review cover page with the SLU logo available at the following website: (need website address)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary
• Summary of the self-study document
• List of persons who were responsible for the preparation of the document

Brief History of the Department or Program

Mission Statement of the Department; Departmental Goals; Program Goals

Description of the Department's Capacity in Addressing the University's Mission

Program Description
• The degrees offered
• The number of majors in the past five years
• The number of minors in the past five years
• Numbers of graduates over the past five years
• Major requirements
• Certificate Programs
• University Core Curriculum courses delivered
• Offerings for other departments
• External accreditation, rankings and awards

Undergraduate Student Information
• Faculty/student ratio
• Information on quality of students
  -Number of applicants, acceptance rate, number accepted but not enrolled, number rejected
  -National test score data
  -Enrollments
  -Number of graduates, including plans for increasing the number of graduates
  -Placement of graduates
  -Percentage of graduates who go on to graduate or professional school
  -Percentage of graduates who go on to graduate or professional school at Saint Louis University
• Information on department’s active involvement in recruitment and retention of students, including strategies for recruiting, retaining, and evaluating high academically performing students
• Summary of notable student accomplishments from the past five years
Graduate Programs

- Graduate curriculum
  - Requirements for various degrees
  - Interdisciplinary relations
  - Research requirements
  - Clinical requirements

- Graduate students
  - Number of applicants, acceptance rate, number accepted but not enrolled, number rejected for the past five years
  - Undergraduate GPA and national test score data
  - Enrollments in the past five years
  - Number of graduates, including plans for increasing the number of graduates
  - Information concerning department’s active involvement in recruitment and retention of students, including strategies for recruiting, retaining, and evaluating high academically performing students
  - Information concerning quality of students
  - Placement of graduate students

Faculty

- Evidence of Quality Teaching, including strategies for enhancing productivity in teaching
- Faculty Scholarship, including strategies for increasing the amount of non-funded and externally funded research and scholarship
  - Monographs
  - Publications
  - Exhibitions/performances/license agreements/patents
  - Significant presentations at professional meetings
  - Funded projects (awarded and anticipated)
- Significant Faculty Service, including strategies for strengthening professional, University and community partnerships
  - To the profession
  - To the University
  - To the community
- Professional and community recognition

Response to the Recommendations from Previous Reviews

- List the recommendations from the last program review
- List the actions taken in response to the last review

Major Changes in Program (within the last five years and anticipated for the next five years)

- Discipline or field
- Student demand
• Occupational demand
• Societal need
• Current and future areas of concern for the department/program

Student Learning Outcomes
• Describe the assessment measures used for each degree offered (including those for information literacy competencies).
• Describe Student Learning Outcomes' fit with the Five Dimensions of the Saint Louis University experience.
• How is assessment information used to improve the curriculum, teaching, and learning?
• What is the evidence that feedback and adjustments actually have improved the curriculum, instruction, and student learning?

Resources Currently Available
• Personnel:
  1. Description of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty with appropriate background information. Should include all faculty vitae.
  2. Description of staff; and roles and responsibilities of graduate assistants.
  3. Description of part-time and adjunct faculty with appropriate background information. Should include all vitae.
• Facilities and major equipment
• General expense budget
• Library resources, including a copy of the collection development analysis report completed for the self-study
• Other resources, including affiliated agencies (e.g., businesses, school, school districts, hospitals, clinics, etc.)

Plans to Modify Resources Over the Next Three Years (differentiate desired and necessary resources and include a plan for procuring funds for resources)
• Personnel
• Facilities and equipment
• Other resources
• Connection to Departmental and Program Goals
• Anticipated Source of Resources
• Plans for reallocation of funds should budget amounts remain at current levels or decrease

Current strengths that support the achievement of program goals
• List and describe

Current weaknesses that impede the achievement of program goals
• List and describe
Future opportunities to explore in the achievement of program goals
  • List and describe

Future threats to overcome in the achievement of program goals
List and describe
APPENDIX B
External Reviewers’ Pre-Visit Checklist

- Program Review Manual
- Program Review Self-Study Report
- Program or Department's Web Page
- Undergraduate Catalog
- Graduate Catalog
- Sponsored Programs Report
- Organizational Charts
- University Mission and Strategic Plans
- The Five Dimensions of the Saint Louis University Experience
- Printed University Visitor Information and Campus Maps
- Saint Louis University Fact Book and Other Relevant Institutional Research
APPENDIX C
Suggested Questions for External Reviewers

Programs and Curricula

Does the department have a well-defined mission and an appropriate corresponding statement of goals?

Do the mission and goals shape and give direction to the department?

Are the curricular offerings adequate to justify the number of options within the programs in the department?

Are the program requirements appropriate?

Is there evidence of periodic curricular review, introduction of new courses, course syllabi?

Is there evidence that the courses of the department serve other departments and schools of the university?

Is there other evidence of interdepartmental cooperation? Team teaching?

Are the department's/program's plans and/or goals appropriate given the external and internal environment?

Faculty

What is the morale of the faculty?

Is there evidence of faculty productivity, of standing nationally, of initiative in seeking support for research opportunities and/or undertaking service to the community?

Is the department's experience in recruiting and retaining faculty appropriate or successful? Is the faculty workload attractive? Are teaching/research resources suitable?

Is there effective leadership in the department?

Students

Is the department successful in the advising and counseling of students?

Does the department appropriately monitor the progress of students and assist students in job placement?

Does the department have appropriate Student Learning Outcomes, assess these regularly, and use the results to make improvements?
Physical Facilities and Other Resources

Are the library holdings adequate (books, journals, reference sources, microforms, audio-visual aids, access to inter-library loans)?

Are the computer facilities appropriate and adequate to faculty and student course usage and research?

Is the level of institutional support and research support adequate for the programs of the Department?

Areas of Excellence

Are there areas of particular excellence or innovative program development?

Areas of Concern

Are there areas of concern?

What recommendations are appropriate for the department or program at this time?
APPENDIX D
External Reviewer Visit--Sample Itinerary

Day 1
8:15 am   Visitors are escorted
to campus and entry meeting

8:30 am – 9:45 am  Breakfast/Entry meeting
Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean, the
Dean of the Graduate School (if graduate programs will be
reviewed), the Department Chairperson, and the Associate Dean
responsible for program review

10:00 am – 11:00 Tour of Facilities

11:00 am – 12:30 Meet with faculty

12:30 – 2:00 pm  Lunch**

2:00 pm – 3:00 pm Meet with Faculty

3:00 pm – 5:30 pm Meet with undergraduate students
Meet with graduate students

6:00 pm   Dinner**

Day 2
8:15 am  Breakfast
Program Chair or Director picks up site visitors and escorts them
to campus

9:00 am – 10:00 am  Meet with University Provost

10:00 am – 11:00 am  Meet with Dean of the Graduate School, if required

11:00 am – noon Library tour/meeting with subject liaison librarian

noon – 1:30 pm  Lunch**

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm  Site visitor preparation meeting to discuss issues, continue site visit
report and prepare exit meeting report

3:00 pm – 4:00 pm Exit meeting with the Senior Associate Provost for Academic
Affairs, the Dean, the Dean of the Graduate School, if appropriate,
and the Associate Dean responsible for program review.
**These meal periods will also be used for meetings with students, faculty, alumni, community constituents, and/or advisory committees. The external review schedule will be developed to include these groups as they can best and most appropriately fit into the schedule.