Program Review:
Purposes, Perspectives, and Processes

Karen E. Black
Stephen P. Hundley
IUPUI

John V. Moore III
Community College of Philadelphia

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this workshop, you should be able to:

1. Identify the purposes and significance of program review
2. Describe various models to program review
3. Discuss some of the approaches to program review
4. Recognize some of the challenges and opportunities program review affords
5. Reflect on, plan for, and/or improve program review options in your own institutional context

Workshop Outline

- Context, definitions, and significance of Program Review
- Background on Program Review
- Program Review in a 4-Year Institution: IUPUI Approach
- Program Review in a 2-Year Institution: Community College of Philadelphia Approach
- Break
- Uses and perspectives on Program Review
- Preparing the institution for Program Review
- Case Studies and SWOT Analysis on Program Review
- Conclusion/Discussion/Q&A

Introduction and Context

Karen E. Black

Director of Program Review

IUPUI (Indiana University -Purdue University Indianapolis)

Stephen Hundley

Chair and Associate Professor

Department of Technology Leadership and Communication

Purdue School of Engineering and Technology

IUPUI

John Moore

Director of Assessment

Community College of Philadelphia

How many colleagues are from 2-year institutions? 4-year institutions?

How many colleagues teach exclusively at the graduate or professional level?

How many colleagues are in programs that are accredited by a discipline-specific body?

How many colleagues have been working with program review for 5 or more years?

Small Group Discussions and Report-Outs

In small groups, choose:
   Timekeeper, Scribe, and Spokesperson

Answer the following questions:

   What is your definition of program review?

   To what extent is program review important?

   What questions do you have concerning program review?

- **Improvement**

- **Accountability**

- **Though not mutually exclusive**

Evaluation Models
(some examples)

- **Input**

- **Connoisseur or Expert**

- **Goal-Based**

- **Hybrid**

- Reputational

- Rankings

- Resources

Disadvantage

    Doesn't look at impact of the institution on student learning

Relies on an outside evaluator

Possible Disadvantage:

Could have missed opportunities to collaborate internally

- Goals clarified
- Indicators are defined
- Achievement data collected
- Results compared to pre-set criteria

Disadvantage

Used alone can omit important unintended outcomes because looking exclusively at goal achievement and *appropriateness* of goals are not assessed

Evaluates both goals and processes

- **When**
  - Reoccurring?
  - Screening?
- **Why**
  - Formative?
  - Summative?
- **Who**
  - Internal?
  - External?
  - Combination?

- **Reoccurring Model (Cycle)**
  - all departments are put on a 5, 7, 9 year cycle
- **Screening Model**
  - Data is reviewed for all departments and based upon results departments are flagged for a comprehensive review
  - Indicators such as enrollment drops, lack of critical mass of faculty, loss of accreditation, and lack of evidence that goals are being accomplished trigger a review

- **Formative**
  - Improving programs, generally internal
- **Summative**
  - Accreditation, generally external

Why not Both?

Coordinate mandatory summative reviews for accreditation with formative internal reviews

- **External peer reviewer**

- **Internal reviewers**

- **Again why not both?**
  - Look to your mission for the answer.

Consider:

How does each of the potential answers to the What, When, Who, Why fit with your mission?

Excellence in

Teaching and Learning

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Civic Engagement, Locally, Nationally, and Globally

with each of these core activities characterized by

- *Collaboration within and across disciplines and with the community*
- *A commitment to ensuring diversity, and*
- *Pursuit of best practices*

Hybrid that is:

- Formative (coordinating with accreditation visits)

- Reoccurring and uses

- Peer reviewers (Connoisseur)

Our experience

- **Planning**

- **Conducting**

- **Using results**

Planning

- **Shared understanding of purpose with program faculty, chair, dean, and campus administration**

- **Costs shared**

- **Questions for reviewers**

- **Who should serve on the team**
    - Internal (2)
    - External (2)
    - Community (1)

- **Self Study**

- **The site visit**

- **Follow-up**

More information on program review:

– *http://www.planning.iupui.edu/assessment/*

See Handout for Guidelines

- **Meet with:**
  - Administrators
  - Faculty
  - Staff
  - Dean
  - Students
  - Community
  - Alumni
- **Exit report with preliminary findings**

- *Department*
  - *reviews the recommendations*
  - *prepares written response*
  - *presents response at meeting with dean and others*
  - *discusses process and outcomes with Program Review and Assessment Committee*

- *Responsible Administrators*
  - *agree upon responsive action(s)*

- *All*
  - *implement responsive actions*
  - *prepare for next review*

- *State mandated, 5 year audit cycles for each program*
  - *About 15 programs a year*
- *Strict financial penalty for noncompliance*
- *2-tiered system*
  - *Small review each year (QVI)*
  - *Full audit every 5 years*

- Quality indicators:
  - Student learning outcomes*
  - Faculty
    - Professional development
    - Evaluation plan
    - Engagement
  - Accreditation (if applicable)
  - Facility oversight (if applicable)
  - Program alliances
  - Academic program innovations
  - Strategic planning

- Viability indicators:
  - Documented need
  - Enrollment*
  - Cost-to-operate
  - Benefit (to College, to Community)
  - Retention (Fall/Fall, Fall/Spring)*
  - Graduation rates*
  - Transfer rates
  - Employment rates
  - Degrees awarded*

- Refer to *CCP Academic Program Audit Guidelines*
  - Program Description
  - Faculty Engagement
  - Demographics
  - Program outcomes
  - Student learning assessments
  - Resources and needs
  - Demand
  - Operational costs

- Process
  - Coordinated by Office of Academic Assessment and Evaluation
  - Designee from each department
  - Supporting data from Institutional Research and from Curriculum Development Office
  - 12-18 months (depending on program size)
  - Departments with an outside accreditation submit a modified Audit
  - Academic Deans and, ultimately, Board of Trustees approves Audit

In small groups, choose:
>   *Timekeeper, Scribe, and Spokesperson*

Answer the following question:

>   What are the roadblocks to implementing program review at your institution?

>   **Incorporate a 10-minute break during this activity and report-outs will be after the break**

Report-outs:

What are the roadblocks to implementing program review at your institution?

- **Matching money from graduate school to fund public scholars**

- **Faculty encouraged to go up for promotion and/or tenure**

- **New deans review findings with department chairs to better understand the department and to clarify goals**

- **Reorganization of departments**
- **Program creation**
- **Reallocation of resources**
- **Submission of successful PhD program**
- **Dean of IT on a team took action based upon meeting with students**
- **Faculty member from another department discovered avenues of collaboration**

- **Concerns, challenges, and expectations perceived by:**
  - Faculty
  - Chairs
  - Deans and academic leaders
  - Campus administrators

Preparing the Institution for Program Review

- Determine purpose(s) and link process to institutional strategic directions
- Senior-level leadership and support – financially and symbolically – must exist
- Elicit buy-in from faculty and administrators
- Emphasize the improvement – not punitive – aspects of the process
- Use the results of program review for improvements
- Consider program review's relationship to assessment and accreditation activities

In small groups, choose:

Timekeeper, Scribe, and Spokesperson

Read the Case Study on Program Review assigned to your group

Provide a brief summary of the group's answers to the questions

Program Review SWOT Analysis

Refer to handout:

"Program Review SWOT Analysis"

Think about Program Review in your own institutional context:

What are the present <u>s</u>trengths?

What are the present <u>w</u>eaknesses?

What are the future <u>o</u>pportunities?

What are the future <u>t</u>hreats?

What actions emerge from SWOT Analysis?

Questions, comments, or concerns about Program Review?

What recommendations or suggestions do you have?

Contact Information

- *Karen E. Black*

  kblack@iupui.edu

- *Stephen P. Hundley*

  shundley@iupui.edu

- *John V. Moore*

  jvmoore@ccp.edu