

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines



**Office of Academic Programs and Assessment (APA, formally APAA)
Updated August 31, 2018**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW 1

SNAPSHOT OF THE PROCESS..... 3

 Preparation and Overview 3

 Timeline..... 4

ADDITIONAL DETAILS 6

SELF-STUDY REPORT 7

METRICS 9

THE REVIEW TEAM 13

SITE VISIT 15

 Example of a Detailed Schedule for Site Visit 16

REVIEWERS’ REPORT 18

ACTION PLAN 19

APPENDIX 1: Outline for the Self-Study Report 21

APPENDIX 2: Metrics Source List 23

APPENDIX 3: Reviewers’ Report Template..... 27

APPENDIX 4: Signature Sheet for Self Study Report..... 28

APPENDIX 5: Signature Sheet for Action Plan..... 29

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Oregon State University (OSU) conducts a variety of reviews including those for newly formed programs, professional licensing and/or accreditation and research programs. OSU's Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) process is a matter of policy, and includes a site visit by an external review team and ongoing yearly assessment reporting using a full cycle assessment process. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Council (FS CC) and the Office of Academic Programs and Assessment (APA, formally APAA) share oversight responsibilities with APA facilitating the review process.

Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews (UAPR) is one of several processes used by OSU to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and use evidence derived from assessing outcomes to inform decision-making processes. OSU's accrediting body, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), outlines this expectation in Standards Two (Resources and Capacity), Three (Planning and Implementation) and Four (Effectiveness and Improvement), with course, program and degree expectations specifically addressed in Standards: 2.C.1, 2.C.2, 3B.1, 3B.2, 4.A.2, 4.A.3, 4.A.4, 4.A.6, 4.B.1 and 4.B.2 (<http://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-policies/standards/>). Additionally, the UAPR process contributes to Mission Fulfillment (NWCCU Standard Five), acting as an evidence-based platform by which OSU can measure and evaluate achievement of goals outlined in OSU's Strategic Plan.

The UAPR incorporates a full cycle assessment process to provide an opportunity for programs to assess the effectiveness of their undergraduate instruction, resources needed to support the program, and development of approaches for continuous improvement. A UAPR is an opportunity to reflect, evaluate and plan in a deliberative and collegial setting. A UAPR can assist in identifying strengths, weaknesses, challenges, aspirations, opportunities and needs, including the:

- academic program's fit with the institutional mission and strategic direction,
- academic program's focus and its alignment with student success,
- learning environment and the extent to which program learning outcomes are achieved,
- extent to which the program is evolving along national trends,
- adequacy of resources,
- areas where OSU can further develop its strengths, and
- potential areas for collaboration and interdisciplinary projects/programs.

The UAPR process, in brief, consists of:

1. Program Self-Study and a site visit by a review team consisting of external and OSU faculty.
2. Reviewer's Report following site visit.
3. Development of a departmental/unit Action Plan (similar to a mini strategic plan).
4. Action Plan presented to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council for review.
5. Provost (or designee) meets with the program's leadership, including the Dean, to discuss the Reviewers' Report and program's Action Plan, and then plan accordingly.
6. Reassessment of progress with a three-year follow-up report.

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews (UAPR) are evaluative in nature. The UAPR assesses the following three components (Inputs, Outcomes, Impacts) within the context of aligning the mission and goals of the program to those of the academic college(s) and the university.

1. **Inputs** — the total resources (human and financial) supporting the program, including students, courses, curriculum, financial support, personnel, and facilities.
2. **Outcomes** — both quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning and attainment of programmatic and course learning outcomes, graduation rate, alumni employment and success, impact of outreach and community engagement, timely completion of degrees, student retention in the program, honors, and awards.
3. **Impacts** — quality of the outcomes or impacts that result from the program, including the professional viability of graduates, their satisfaction, national rankings, impact statements, and community engagement.

Institutional Research (IR) provides data on core metrics common to all units ***upon request by the unit***. The data provided by IR are indicated in Appendix 2. Other data will need to be collected by the unit. Units should use their annual assessment reports describing assessment of program specific learning outcomes. This annual assessment report summarizes assessment data, documents successes related to learning outcomes, and identifies target areas for improvement. Tracking these reports over time provides important input for judging the trajectory of a program. Annual assessment reports are located on the SharePoint website.

Postponement

In highly unusual circumstances, a program may request a postponement. Postponement may not exceed one academic year. APA and the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council must be in concurrence that a postponement is justifiable.

SNAPSHOT OF THE PROCESS

Undergraduate Academic Program Reviews (UAPR) that include external reviewers are conducted on a decennial schedule (calendar is located on APA website). Supplemental interim reviews may be conducted as requested by the unit, the college dean, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, or may be required by the Provost (or appointee) or Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.

The following is a snapshot of the review process. The terminology used below distinguishes between the specific program under review and the unit in which it is housed. While these may be identical, some programs are operated distinct from their home unit.

Preparation

The Office of Academic Programs and Assessment (APA) facilitates the review process by notifying the unit head and corresponding college leadership of academic programs proposed for review in advance of the review schedule.

Interdisciplinary baccalaureate programs fall within the purview of this policy; where these guidelines refer to "dean" or "department," or use other terms that do not fully apply to interdisciplinary programs, appropriate adjustments will be made by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council to assure a meaningful and efficient review.

Overview

- The APA representative works with the unit head and/or program lead and the chair of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council to establish review team composition, the timing of the review, and the content appropriate for the self-study report.
- The unit head, program director, or designee is responsible for guiding the preparation of the Self-Study Report and other materials appropriate for the review.
- The Review team, consisting of external faculty and OSU Faculty Senate Curriculum Council members, conducts a site visit.
- The Review team submits a review report (Reviewers' Report).
- The program (i.e. Academic Unit) develops an Action Plan in response to the Reviewer's Report. The College leadership reads the Action Plan and signs it before the Action Plan is submitted to APA.
- The Action Plan is presented to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. A review is considered complete upon Faculty Senate Curriculum Council's vote to accept the unit's Action Plan. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Council may attach an addendum to the Action Plan.
- The Provost (or designee) meets with the program's leadership, including the Dean, to discuss the Reviewers' Report and program's Action Plan, and then plan accordingly.
- The program submits a 3-Year Follow-Up Report. This report is reviewed by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council and the Provost (or designee).

Timeline

PRE VISIT TIMELINE

Annually Since the Last Academic Program Review:

- Program reviews and updates its comprehensive assessment plan and curriculum map.
- Program compiles, analyzes and documents assessment of student learning data.
- Program assembles and tracks data/metrics necessary and useful for the review.

6 Months to 1 Year Before the Review:

- APA reminds program of the upcoming academic program review.
- Program identifies several possible dates for the review.
 - Identify three consecutive days for the review. Leadership, such as Deans and unit heads, will need to be present for days 2 and 3 of the review.
- Program director and/or unit head (or designee) guides preparation of a Self-Study Report.
- Program requests data from the Office of Institutional Research.
- Program assembles internal data. See Appendix 2 for table of suggested data sets.

3 to 6 Months Before the Site Visit:

- Program submits to APA representative a list of ten to twelve external disciplinary peers (including complete contact information) for the review team (and if applicable, two to three representatives from employing profession).

2 to 4 Months Before the Site Visit:

- Program makes travel and lodging arrangements for the external reviewers.

1 to 3 Months Before the Site Visit:

- Program submits to APA representative a draft site visit schedule.
- Program reserves rooms and informs Leadership, including the Provost's office, and others of dates.

4 to 5 Weeks Before the Site Visit:

- Program submits to APA a draft electronic copy of the Self-Study Report if the program wants APA to provide an initial review to ensure all components are present.

2 Weeks Before the Site Visit:

- Program submits to APA an electronic copy of the final version of the Self-Study Report.
- APA distributes the electronic Self-Study Report to the review team members.
- Program sends Self-Study Report to their Dean/Associate Dean and Provost (or Provost designee).

Note: Failure to provide a Self-Study Report in a timely manner and/or lack of cooperation with the review process will lead to suspension of new student enrollment in the program, which may result in termination of the program.

SITE VISIT TIMELINE (Sample site visit schedule on pages 16-17)

DAY 1 – Evening: Review Orientation Dinner

DAY 2 – All Day: Interviews and Report Writing

DAY 3 – Morning (8am to noon): Report Back to Faculty and Administrators

NOTE: The program lead and administrative support should be available during the site visit to provide any requested information, attend to last minute needs, and escort review team, etc.

POST SITE VISIT TIMELINE

1 Week After the Site Visit

- Program submits to APA additional feedback from faculty and students who were not present at the site visit or who had follow up comments.

2 to 4 Weeks After the Site Visit

- Reviewers submit Reviewer's Report to APA representative no later than four weeks after site visit.
- APA forwards the Reviewer's Report to the program lead.
- Program reads the Reviewer's Report and can submit a response to APA within two weeks of receiving the report. *A response to Reviewer's Report is not required and is not the same as the Action Plan.*

2 to 4 Months After the Site Visit

- The program develops an Action Plan in response to the Reviewer's Report. The College leadership reads the Action Plan and signs it before the Action Plan is submitted to APA.
- **Program submits the signed Action Plan to APA within 3 to 4 months upon receiving the Reviewers' Report.**

3 to 6 Months After the Site Visit

- An internal member of the Review Committee presents the Action Plan to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council for review and a vote to accept the plan.

6 to 12 Months After the Site Visit

- Program and College leadership meets with the Provost (or designee) to discuss Reviewers' Report and implementation of the Action Plan.

3 Years After the Site Visit

- Program prepares and submits a 3-Year Follow-Up Report to APA.
- APA forwards the 3-Year Follow-Up Report to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council and the Provost (or designee).

ADDITIONAL DETAILS

Departments/schools may offer multiple baccalaureate majors, minors, and options and may contribute to interdisciplinary majors and minors, the Honors College, general education (Baccalaureate Core), and provide service courses for other majors. APA, obtaining guidance from Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, will work with the program leader to clearly define the scope of undergraduate instruction to be considered in the review. In general, the academic program review should be designed to be comprehensive, encompassing all aspects of a department's/ school's/ college's undergraduate educational contributions.

APA is available to review a draft of the Self-Study Report **four to five weeks before the site visit.**

The academic program must submit to APA an electronic copy of the final version of the Self-Study Report two weeks before the site visit. APA will distribute, by email, the electronic Self-Study Report to all review team members. APA places all documents in SharePoint. If there are large electronic files, break them down into separate appendices, as some email servers reject large files.

APA will send the Self-Study Report to reviewers. The academic program will be responsible for sending the Self-Study Report to their Dean/Associate Dean and Provost (or Provost designee), faculty, students, and other appropriate parties. Additional copies may be needed if a Graduate Academic Program Review is being conducted concurrent with the Undergraduate Academic Program Review. It is the responsibility of the program leadership to determine any needs and requirements of other review agencies.

The academic program will be responsible for all scheduling related to the three days of the site visit, including arranging for the site visit team to meet with the Dean/Associate Dean and Provost (or Provost designee). Please see pages 16-17 of this document for an example of a site visit schedule.

Note: If Self-Study documents for the review are not received by the agreed-upon deadline, if documents lack essential/meaningful content, or if there are no efforts towards completing the review process, then admission of new student enrollment in to the program will be suspended.

SELF-STUDY REPORT

The primary benefit of an academic program review process lies in the opportunity for self-analysis and the use of this analysis (along with the feedback provided by the Review team) in subsequent program improvement. With the goal to derive maximum benefits from the external review effort, the Self-Study Report is approached as a process of reflection, analysis, communication and planning rather than as an exercise in generating paper.

The narrative of the Self-Study Report is, at its core, an analysis of the program’s mission and strategic goals, and how the metrics and other qualitative data reflect the unit’s achievement of those. The Self-Study Report should review unit accomplishments over the decade, identify strengths, weaknesses and challenges, and convey the work of the unit regarding a long-term vision and the role of the degree program in that vision.

The Self-Study Report is prepared collectively by the faculty and administration of the academic program unit, and represents an opportunity for colleagues to review departmental, school, or college accomplishments as well as course and program outcomes, to share concerns and aspirations, and to develop a long-term vision and strategies for improvement and enhancement. The Self-Study Report documents analysis considered during the self-study and describes the conclusions emerging from this analytical and reflective process.

The program director, unit head, or unit designee is responsible for guiding the preparation of the Self-Study Report and assembling data and materials pertinent to the review. The Self-Study Report should be prepared in close collaboration with the faculty, students, staff and leadership of the program unit. ***The person responsible for the Self-Study Report will ensure, in writing (via the signed transmittal sheet in Appendix 4), that all faculty members had an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study and review the final document.***

The Self-Study Report should include pertinent data, an analysis and interpretation of those data (specific data suggested for the self-study are in Appendices 1 and 2), program decisions informed by data, as well as impacts of the program. Interpretation should be an assessment of program strengths, weaknesses, challenges, needs and opportunities, thus allowing Review team members to understand what is leading to the academic program’s self-recommendations.

Appendix 1 provides a suggested outline for the Self-Study Report. The first written section needs to address the question “Why is the degree program offered?” The report should begin by presenting or describing the:

- context of the academic program review, including history of the program;
- mission statement of the academic unit;
- academic unit’s mission relationship to the mission of the school/college and the University;
- major short- and long-term goals of the academic unit;
- undergraduate degree program, both curricular and co-curricular (high impact practices);
- issues, challenges, and opportunities confronting the unit/program; and
- specific comments to the reviewers for which you would appreciate their input or insight.

A significant portion of the self-study is devoted to presentation of metrics (pages 9-12 and Appendix 2), both as **inputs of resources and as outcomes of program performance**. Sections 2 and 3 address these data. Section 2 describes the program and inputs. This section needs to answer the questions, “What do you do, with what, and how?” This includes the methods and extent to which the academic unit collects evidence of student learning through assessment. Section 3 describes the program outcomes, assessment process and addresses the questions, “How well do you do what you do?” “What difference does it make whether you do what you do or not?” “How do you know?” This section provides evidence that assessment data is informing decision making as it relates to the program, its curriculum and the student experience.

Section 4 describes the programs impacts, including the viability of the graduates, their satisfaction, national rankings, impact statements, and community engagement. The last section is the summary and needs to answer the questions, “What have we learned from the program review process?”, “What are the program’s self-recommendations?” and “What vision or goals do you have for the program’s future?”

There should be an honest assessment of inputs—the adequacy of the infrastructure supporting the program (quality of students, curriculum, physical facilities; accessibility of courses, technology, physical facilities; resources; personnel; faculty profile; general infrastructure). Some data sources for general OSU statistics are provided below. ***These data need to be used as comparative data. If there are questions about comparative data, contact Institutional Research or APA.***

- “Enrollment/Demographic Reports”
<http://institutionalresearch.oregonstate.edu/enrollment-and-demographic-reports>
- Graduation summaries
<http://institutionalresearch.oregonstate.edu/retentiondegreegraduation-reports>
- “Faculty/Staff Reports”
<http://institutionalresearch.oregonstate.edu/faculty-and-staff-reports>

Measuring and assessing program performance is the heart of the self-study. This involves assessing the quality of the undergraduate program including the breadth and depth of its capacity to fulfill its mission and goals. Items to be considered and evaluated include: student learning outcomes (SLOs), curriculum map (assessment resources and curriculum map template can be found at <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/apaa/assessment-resources>), direct and indirect assessment activities to measure achievement of outcomes, student and faculty performance metrics, recruitment and retention of students, diversity among faculty and students, how the program meets the needs of all stakeholders, student persistence/retention, honors and awards, academic honesty, research and scholarly activity, and metrics for operational effectiveness. There should be clearly identifiable links between the measurement of program performance and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessment in the program. The program should use its annual Assessment Reports to document its understanding of achievement of SLOs and track the progress of continuous improvement. In addition, the self-study should engage in describing the quality of the outcomes that result from the existence of the undergraduate program (i.e. placement of graduates, student and alumni satisfaction level, employer assessment of program quality, and program improvements) resulting from assessment feedback.

Please avoid using pictures in the self-study. However, the use of graphs and tables to illustrate analysis of data are strongly encouraged.

METRICS

The metrics, input and outcomes, included in the self-study report are described here. Please address these input and outcomes data in the relevant sections of the self-study report. Descriptions of data sources can be found in Appendix 2.

An outline of the contents of the Self-Study Report is presented in Appendix I. Essential data that should be presented in either tables or figures can be provided within the Self-Study Report or in appendices. ***The original data tables provided by Institutional Research must be included in an appendix in their “raw” form,*** although these data need to be summarized or presented in graphs or tables in the text of the Self-Study Report. Additional data or materials may be included as deemed necessary by the academic program under review. Examples of effective self-study documents are available for review upon permission from the programs generating these documents.

During academic program reviews, ten years of core metrics based on Fall term data will be available from the Office of Institutional Research (<http://institutionalresearch.oregonstate.edu/>) as part of the self-study document. The last year of decadal data to be included in the self-study document is from the Fall term of the previous year. For example, if a review is scheduled in Winter 2018, the data should be summarized from Fall 2008 – Fall 2017. Requests for data from the Office of Institutional Research needs to be in advance so as to allow time to assemble data. At all times, any core metrics not regularly provided centrally by Institutional Research are the responsibility of the academic program.

There may be additional information the program or unit may wish to use to capture unique aspects beyond what is provided in the metrics list. **The program needs to contact IR for these data.** Questionnaires, as an indirect assessment method, may be used to gather impressions of academic program strengths and weaknesses, as well as impacts. Questionnaires should be anonymous, and designed and administered with care. [Note: The OSU Survey Research Center can help provide assistance regarding the design and application of a survey as well as an analysis of the survey responses.]

Metrics to provide and analyze in a Self-Study Report

General:

- If applicable and where possible, separate the data by campus (Corvallis, Cascades, Eastern and Hatfield, etc.) and mode of delivery (Ecampus)
- If applicable account for degree options and certificates.
- Where possible and meaningful, provide the data in a graph or visual format rather than a numeric table.
- Provide raw data from IR in an appendix.
- Provide comparative data for the university, college and other similar programs if available.

Students:

- Student data should try to account for/differentiate students who begin and end in the major and those who switched.
- Categorize student by **admission** (applicants; admitted), **enrolled** (matriculated “enrolled” in

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

OSU vs currently enrolled – annualized to Fall term - transfer in-out (internal/external) and or withdrawn), **completion**

Divide student data by:

- Gender
 - Citizenship
 - Residency
 - Race/ethnicity
 - Pell/loans/financial need
 - Incoming GPA; Cumulative OSU GPA (<2.0; 2.1–2.5; 2.6–3.0; 3.1–3.5; 3.6–4.0)
 - SAT/ACT score(s) (compare to OSU average) (possibly compare to other institutions by program CIP number, but this often costs money)
 - TOEFL
 - Admitted/applied ratio; matriculated/admitted ratio; denied/applied ratio
 - Degree, certificates enrolled in, specialties/concentrations
 - Participation rates in First Year Experience courses
 - Participation rates in co-curricular high impact practices
- Student honors/awards, scholarly papers/presentations, and/or undergraduate research
 - Degrees and certificates (if applicable) awarded per year, trend over the past 10 years
 - Licensure exam data (if applicable)
 - Degrees awarded by campus – type and head count
 - Graduation #s and %
 - Time to degree (Average and # students: <4 years, 4–6 years, 7+ years)
 - Retention rates (1st and 2nd year)
 - # of credit hours by graduation (frequency count by number of hours e.g. 180–190; 190–200; etc.)
 - Post-graduation data (If available)
 - Employment demographics
 - Satisfaction surveys
 - Alumni surveys
 - Employer assessment

Student Learning and Curriculum (this is a main focus of the Self-Study Report):

- Curriculum
- Program learning outcomes
- Matrix/map (courses mapped to program learning outcomes and description of key assessments mapped to courses)
- Assessment of Student Learning
 - Summaries of annual assessment reports and activities
 - Direct and Indirect assessment methods used
 - Description of full-cycle assessment
 - Organizational structure for the assessment process
 - Analysis of assessment data
 - Examples of assessment informed curricular decisions
- Core curriculum requirements per major/minor/electives; program variation options
- Contributions to the Baccalaureate Core and syllabus for each Bacc Core course

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

- Course syllabus for each course
- Course access, enrollment, demographics
 - Frequency taught
 - Last term taught
 - Taught by rank/type (GTA, instructor, assist/assoc/prof)
 - Access to courses (required: on campus, Ecampus, frequency of offering, enrollment versus capacity; electives)
 - Enrollment major and non-major
 - Indicate if Bacc Core/WIC
 - By location
 - Course designators (old and current)
 - Courses not taught but still in catalog
 - Courses removed in the past 10 years
 - D, F, Withdraw rates
 - Average enrollment numbers per term
- Participation in AAC & U “High impact practices” (1st year seminars & experiences; learning communities; service/community based learning; study abroad; UG research; internship; culminating experience)
 - Describe practices and % of the students engaged in these practices
- Description of curriculum management process
- Articulation agreements/curriculum guides

Faculty:

- FTE Headcount & Instructional Distribution
 - Instructional faculty/student ratio
 - SCH/faculty/year for past 3 years (tenured, tenured track, professional)
 - Course list/faculty/year for past 3 years (tenured, tenured track, professional)
 - Advisor/student ratio
 - Staff
- Faculty Demographics FTE
 - Gender
 - Citizenship
 - Race/ethnicity
 - Type/rank/tenure status
- Faculty engagement in Professional Development (DPD, WIC, diversity, specialized training in student success and teaching)
- Scholarship/Research
 - Peer reviewed publications by year for the past 10 years and number of citations
 - Grants and contracts: Number and amount by year for the past 10 years
 - Patents
 - Other scholarly works
 - Awards
- Trends in eSET scores by course or category of courses (service courses and major courses; or 100 level, 200 level, 300 level, 400 level) (eSET scores separated for Ecampus, if applicable)

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

Facilities:

- Total number of rooms and types of rooms controlled by the unit; utilization of those rooms
- Total capacity (# rooms/ # people per room; capacity: enrollment ratio)
- Computing and technology (currently have; accessibility of technology to students; student use of technology; would like to have)
- Accessibility of physical facilities to disabled

Budget Related:

- Operation expenditures (service & supply expenditures; teaching, admin, research salaries)
- Revenue
- Actual and % of how the budget has changed over the past 10 years

General:

- Organization chart
- National rankings

If the program conducts surveys (i.e. survey of current students, survey of alumni), then please note that surveys are indirect measures of student learning. To ensure respondent confidentiality, do not include original questionnaires in the self-study or appendices. These data should be tabulated and interpreted in the narrative of the self-study. Additionally, Institutional Research will provide the program with results from its annual exit survey of degree recipients as well as university core metrics.

Note: Failure to provide a Self-Study Report in a timely manner and/or lack of cooperation with the review process will lead to suspension of new student enrollment in the program, which may result in termination of the program.

THE REVIEW TEAM

Three to six months before the site visit the program submits to the APA representative a list of ten to twelve external disciplinary peers (including complete contact information) and two to three representatives from employing profession (if applicable) for the review team. The list should include detailed contact information (full name, title, institution, address, telephone number, and email address) for each person.

The Review Team consists of three to five reviewers (minimum of three). Two to three reviewers are external and one to two internal reviewers are from the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.

One of the external reviewers should be from out of state, be knowledgeable and reputable in the field, and have worked in academia recently. One of the reviewers must be a member of the OSU Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. Additional reviewers are appointed as needed, one may be from an employing profession and can be from in or out of state. Internal appointees must be from outside of the program being reviewed.

Assignment of at least one (up to two) Curriculum Council member(s) to the Review Team is the responsibility of the Chair(s) of the Curriculum Council. On-campus members of the Review Team should be from a college other than that of the program under review and may be chosen from a department, school, or college with strong undergraduate instruction connections to the program under review: e.g., from an academic unit that requires course work in the undergraduate academic unit under review.

The Office of Academic Programs and Assessment (APA), having received recommendations from the department chair/school director and the college dean, appoints the other members of the Review Team.

The external reviewers should be highly knowledgeable and reputable leaders in the field under review. While the Review Team members may vary in their familiarity with the subject matter of the program, all should be well versed in undergraduate education.

1. Academic peer reviewers should understand university operations and the role of undergraduate education in a comprehensive research university and have the ability to realistically evaluate the program's strengths and weaknesses relative to similar programs at comparable institutions, the program's operations, plans for growth and development, and the professional activities of faculty members.
2. The external employer reviewer should also be a highly knowledgeable and reputable leader in his/her field and should have a high degree of familiarity with the current and future needs of degree employees in the field, be very knowledgeable about industry trends, and be familiar with graduates of the program and of similar programs.

External reviewers cannot have a conflict of interest with OSU (such as former mentors or close personal friends of OSU faculty members), be former OSU employees, or individuals who have applied or are likely to apply for a position at OSU. Individuals from institutions substantially different in character from OSU may be less likely to understand local circumstances. Former OSU students

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

are allowable under certain circumstances: if it has been more than 15 years since their graduation, they do not currently have grants/projects/patents affiliated with faculty in the program being reviewed, or they are the third external reviewer typically representing industry/employers of OSU students.

Exceptions to reviewer requirements must be approved by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.

An APA representative accompanies the Review Team during the site visit, but is not an official member of the Review team.

Expenses of the external reviewers, including travel, lodging, meals, honorarium, as well as all other costs associated with the conduct of the review are the responsibility of the unit/program and/or College whose program is being reviewed. Financial expenses need to be worked out ahead of time within the unit/program and college. In some colleges, these costs are managed centrally in the dean's office. Travel, lodging, meals and refreshments and meeting room arrangements are made by the program.

SITE VISIT

The site visit typically spans three days but may be extended if deemed desirable by the Review Team or program, or if a joint review is conducted. The program, in consultation with the APA representative, will develop the site visit schedule. Arrangements for scheduling participants and for locating space are the responsibility of the program.

- DAY 1 – Evening: Review Orientation Dinner – This dinner is attended by the Review team, APA representative and a representative from the program. The APA representative orients the Review team to the process including questions for the review and identifies any additional information needed to conduct the review.
- DAY 2 – All Day: Site Visit Interviews and Evening Report Writing – A day-long schedule of meetings with administrators (including the Dean and any other key administrators), faculty, students and staff involved with the program is conducted. The Review Team has a working dinner to identify strengths, challenges, weaknesses and recommendations and prepares a written draft of the Reviewers’ Report during this time.
- DAY 3 – Morning: Report Back –The primary outcome of this day is the Review team provides report back sessions for the leadership (program lead, department/school leadership, College Dean, Provost or Senior Vice Provost) in a single session. A report back session to the faculty may also be scheduled. The Review Team will need additional report writing time on this day before the report back sessions.

The site visit can include interviews with the college dean(s), the program director, faculty (separate meetings for tenured, tenure track and instructional), staff, undergraduate students, graduate teaching assistants, and others as appropriate. The program director (or other affiliated administrators) does not participate in the separate interviews other than his/her own sessions with the Review team. Confidentiality must be maintained in all discussions. It is helpful to schedule time with students early in the day so that the Review Team can further examine any issues or concerns that may have been raised by students over the course of the day’s agenda. Additional materials may be requested by the Review Team and reviewed at this time if appropriate. Time should also be arranged for any faculty or staff member or student who wishes to have a private meeting with the Review Team. The Review Team usually observes the facilities of the program.

An opportunity should be extended for additional feedback to the Review Team after the site visit, to allow input from faculty and students who may not be present at the site visit or who may have follow-up comments. These data should be delivered to the APA representative who will share it with the Review Team no later than one week after the site visit.

The Review Team reviews and analyzes its findings, discusses its sense of the review and generates a written draft Reviewers’ Report at dinner on Day Two of the site visit (see example site visit schedule on pages 16-17). This is a particularly important opportunity to capture the observations of the external reviewer(s) while employing a cooperative synthesis approach to generate a Reviewers’ Report so to ensure all reviewers have an opportunity to provide comprehensive input.

Example of a Detailed Schedule for Site Visit

The following is an example outline for a site visit schedule. The schedule will need to be adjusted based upon people’s availability and the unique needs of the program. **It is recommended that people with power differentiation be in separate meetings and have an opportunity to talk freely. It is also recommended that all meetings be held in the same room.** It is suggested the program consult with the APA representative about the site visit schedule.

DAY ONE

- 5:45 pm Program representative picks up the external reviewers from the hotel and transports them to dinner
- 6:00 – 8:00 pm Dinner with review team: typically two external reviewers, two internal reviewers, representative from APA and representative from program. (Restaurants that can direct bill the unit, are quiet and/or have a separate eating area, have a diverse menu, and will accommodate dietary requests are suggested.)

DAY TWO

- 8:15 am Program representative picks up the external reviewers from the hotel (external reviewers eat breakfast at hotel before being brought to campus)
- 8:30 – 9:15 am Program Director/Coordinator
- 9:15 – 9:45 am Unit Head (if different from the program director/coordinator)
- 9:45 – 10:15 am Dean (and other members of the leadership team) of the college
- 10:15 – 10:30 am Break
- 10:30 – 11:15 am Tenured faculty
- 11:15 – noon Tenure-track faculty
- 12:15 – 1:15 pm Lunch with undergraduate students
- 1:15 – 1:45 pm Instructors/Advisors
- 1:45 – 2:00 pm Break
- 2:00 – 2:45 pm Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee or Representative
- 2:45 – 3:30 pm Facilities tour (optional)
- 3:30 – 4:00 pm Staff (optional)

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

- 4:00 – 4:30 pm Program Director/Coordinator (opportunity to ask last minute questions)
- 5:00 – 6:00 pm Break
- 6:00 – 10:00 pm ***Review team meets for a working dinner at the hotel where the external reviewers are staying, and prepares a written draft report*** that analyzes and identifies strengths, challenges, weaknesses, and recommendations

DAY THREE

- 8:15 am Program representative picks up the external reviewers from the hotel (external reviewers eat breakfast at hotel before being brought to campus)
- 8:30 – 10:30 am Review team works on finalizing draft report and prepares to present report.
- 10:30 – 11:00 am Review team meets with the Dean, Program Director, and Provost (or designee) reports back draft strengths, challenges, weaknesses, and recommendations. The program works with the Provost's office to schedule the Provost (or designee) for this meeting.
- 11:00 – 11:30 am Review team meets with the faculty for report back.

Reviewers' Report

Based on the site visit and analysis of the materials presented in the Self-Study Report, the Review Team prepares a draft written report of its findings during the working dinner on Day 2 of the site visit and finalizes the formal Reviewers' Report within two to four weeks of the site visit. The Reviewers' Report template is located in Appendix 3 (page 27 of this document). The Reviewers' Report provides both evaluation and constructive recommendations, and will evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and challenges in terms of inputs, outcomes and productivity from the program. The process used to generate the Reviewers' Report is a process called cooperative synthesis which ensures that all reviewers contribute, in an integrated and cooperative fashion, to each section of the report so that all Reviewers' input are reflected in all sections of the report.

The Reviewers' Report indicates an overall recommendation to discontinue, suspend, reduce, restructure, maintain, or expand the program. Detailed recommendations should be made in support of the overall recommendation and be designed to improve the program's quality, increase its effectiveness, or utilize the university's resources more efficiently.

The Reviewers' Report is sent to the APA representative who forwards the report to the program administrator. It is the responsibility of the program administrator to provide a copy of the Reviewers' Report to the college dean(s) and others as appropriate.

Response to the Reviewers' Report

The program director/chair/unit leadership may choose to prepare a response to the Reviewers' Report that will be submitted with the Self-Study and Reviewers' Report to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council. This response allows the program/unit to share any concerns about the Reviewers' Report or site visit or provide corrections as part of the record. **The response to the Reviewers' Report is not the same as the Action Plan.** The response to the Reviewers' Report must be submitted to APA within two weeks of receiving the final version of the Reviewers' Report. Title the document "Response to Reviewers' Report." Do not edit the Reviewers' Report or change recommendations or observations made by reviewers.

Action Plan

An Action Plan is to be prepared within three months of receiving the Reviewers' Report (or by another date as agreed upon by all parties and with good reason, such as summer break). Preparation of the Action Plan is expected to be a joint/collaborative effort involving faculty, staff, and program leadership, with program leadership leading this process. ***The person responsible for the Action Plan will ensure, in writing (via the signed transmittal sheet in Appendix 5, page 29 of this document), that all faculty members had an opportunity to participate in the development of the Action Plan and review the final document. Additionally, this transmittal sheet requires the Dean's signature indicating the Dean has reviewed the final Action Plan document and discussed it with the Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair for this program.***

The Action Plan needs to address each of the Review team's recommendations to improve program quality and include specific actions to be taken, by whom, and over what time frame. It needs to include goals, objectives, and reliable and meaningful measures to identify whether the goals and objectives have been met. It also needs to address this work in the context of the College's and University's strategic objectives.

The Action Plan needs to be formatted in a way that is easily readable and clearly identifies actions/steps, metrics, timelines, and responsible parties. In addition to an introduction section summarizing the program's review process, reviewers' recommendations, and answers to questions such as, How do these steps meet the recommendation? How will you know it is working?

Please include a table in the Action Plan with the following format:

Review Report Recommendation:

Action	Metric	Anticipated Outcome/Goal	Who	When

The Action Plan can have two tiered plans, one based on current resources and one based on conditional resources not under the program's control (e.g. additional funds allocated by the Dean).

The program might not be able to take action, or take only limited action, on a recommendation, particularly if the recommendation is dependent upon resources outside of its control (such as resources from the Dean or Provost). In those cases, the program should communicate the following in the Action Plan:

- State that the recommendation requires resources that are outside of the direct control of the program;
- Develop two contingent actions for that recommendation, one that assumes the resources will be allocated, and one describing actions that will be taken without additional resources.

If a program does not agree with a recommendation, then this action should be addressed in the Action Plan and discussed with APA who may arrange further conversations with Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, unit leadership, the Dean, and/or the Provost (or designee). This discussion will

take into consideration the next steps for the Action Plan.

After the unit head (Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair) and Dean reviews and signs the Action Plan and then submits to APA, then APA will forward the Action Plan to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council.

All documents related to the UAPR will be stored on SharePoint. SharePoint is a permissions-based site. Contact APA about permissions.

(<https://sharepoint.oregonstate.edu/sites/APAA/assessment/default.aspx>)

Consideration of the Self-Study, Reviewers' Report and Action Plan

The Faculty Senate Curriculum Council will arrange for UAPR documents to be available to members of this council and to be presented at a regular meeting of the Curriculum Council where they are formally considered. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Council may accept the Action Plan, accept the Action Plan with revisions, or send the Action Plan back for further work. The Faculty Senate Curriculum Council may also attach an addendum to the Action Plan containing comments, suggestions, or recommendations.

Institutional Planning and Mission Fulfillment

After the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council has voted to accept the UAPR Action Plan and notifies APA of this action, APA notifies the Provost (or designee) that the UAPR is complete and the documents from this review are available for institutional planning and mission fulfillment. The Provost (or designee) meets with the program's leadership, including the Dean, to discuss the Reviewers' Report and program's Action Plan, and then plan accordingly.

Follow-up

Three years after the site visit the program submits a status report to APA. The Action Plan will provide the basis for the three year follow-up status report. APA, Faculty Senate Curriculum Council, the Dean, and the Provost (or designee) will examine progress achieved through the implementation of the Action Plan. Faculty Senate Curriculum Council will provide written recommendations to be shared with the program and administration. Outcomes of the follow-up review could range from a conclusion that the Action Plan implementation is well under way, to a recommendation that insufficient progress has been made and a need exists for further conversation among the program leader, college dean(s), Provost (or designee) regarding the future of the program.

Note: Failure to complete any of these steps will result in suspension of students admitted to the program.

APPENDIX 1: Outline for the Self-Study Report

The following outline indicates the content that is essential to the Self-Study Report. Additional information is appropriate if it will enhance the effectiveness of the presentation of the program quality. Materials unrelated to the objectives of the program review process should not be included.

The document should not contain information on employees or students that is considered confidential or restricted. The document should contain a table of contents with page numbers to aid the Review team in locating information.

SELF-STUDY REPORT

PRE-TEXT PAGES

- Cover page - List name of program to be reviewed. List all participating departments.
- Table of Contents
- Sign-off sheet (Appendix 4) - Include signature of program director and unit head indicating that all faculty members had an opportunity to participate in the development of the self-study and had an opportunity to review the final document.

I. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

This section should provide history and address the question, “Why do you offer the program?” (See pages 7-8 of this document for additional content expected in this section.)

- Context of the academic program review, including history of the program and a description of the process by which the Self-Study Report was written and who was involved. Describe changes since the last Program Review if these documents are available.
- Mission statement of the program, explaining how the program mission relates to the school/college(s) and university missions.
- Goals - List short term and long term goals of the program for the next 10 years
- Describe undergraduate degree program, both curricular and co-curricular (high impact practices)
- Describe program strengths and opportunities
- Describe challenges and issues
- Communicate program goals and outcomes
- Recommend to reviewers where you would appreciate their input or insight

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND INPUTS

This section should answer questions such as, “What do you do, with what and how?” This section describes the program and curricular structure, program outcomes, assessment process (including the methods and extent to which the academic unit collects evidence of student learning through assessment), faculty qualifications, available resources and infrastructure, student qualifications and achievements, student participation in co-curricular high impact practices, etc. (See pages 7-8, 9-12 and Appendix 2 of this document for content expected in this section.)

- Include descriptions of leadership, committees and program structure, including their roles in curricular decisions, student experiences and program objectives.
- Provide program learning outcomes, curriculum details, assessment practices (how do you analyze program learning outcomes?)
- Refer to the Metrics list (see pages 9-12 and Appendix 2 of this document). Present trends in

data formatted as graphs and tables.

III. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

This section should answer questions such as, “How well do you do what you do?”; “What difference does it make whether you do what you do or not?”; “How do you know?” This section provides evidence that assessment data is informing decision making as it relates to the program, its curriculum and the student experience. (See pages 7-8 of this document for additional content expected in this section.)

- Refer to Metrics list on pages 9-12 of this document. Present an analysis and interpretation of trends in the data from these metrics to address these types of questions.

IV. IMPACTS AND MISSION FULFILLMENT

This section should answer the questions, “What impacts has our program had on the field and/or the state or local communities?” This section describes the quality of the outcomes that result from the existence of the undergraduate program (i.e. placement of graduates, student and alumni satisfaction level, employer assessment of program quality, and program improvements) resulting from assessment feedback.

- Discuss and provide evidence and statements of the impact of the program, including the professional viability of graduates, their satisfaction, national rankings, impact statements and community engagement.

V. SUMMARY

This section should answer the questions, “What have we learned from the program review process?”, “What are the program’s self-recommendations?”, and “What vision or goals do you have for the program’s future?”

- Self-recommendations – List recommendations for enhancing program quality based on analysis and interpretation of the self-study document, or for dissolution of the program.

VI. REQUIRED APPENDICES

- Raw data from Institutional Research (IR)
- CVs
- Syllabi (up to date) for all courses with learning outcomes
- Curriculum outline, learning outcomes, frequency of courses taught, who teaches
- Curriculum map
- Table: List of faculty, grants and number of publications in the past 10 years, number of undergraduate students currently supervising in a lab or for thesis/major project, courses taught in the past 2 years with number of credits and number of students in each course.

APPENDIX 2: Metrics Source List

Note: all national or peer comparisons will be the responsibility of the Academic Unit.

Students

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Student awards/honors/ presentations/research		Academic Unit
Applicants	Gender	IR
Applicants	Citizenship	IR
Applicants	Residency	IR
Applicants	Ethnicity	IR
Applicants	Pell/loans/financial aid	IR
Applicants	Incoming GPA	IR
Applicants	OSU cumulative GPA	IR
Applicants	SAT scores	IR
Applicants	ACT scores	IR
Applicants	TOEFL	IR
Applicants	Degree type sought	IR
Applicants	Options	IR
Admits	Gender	IR
Admits	Citizenship	IR
Admits	Residency	IR
Admits	Ethnicity	IR
Admits	Pell/loans/financial	IR
Admits	Incoming GPA	IR
Admits	OSU cumulative GPA	IR
Admits	SAT scores	IR
Admits	ACT scores	IR
Admits	TOEFL	IR
Admits	Degree type sought	IR
Admits	Options	IR
Matriculated	Gender	IR
Matriculated	Citizenship	IR
Matriculated	Residency	IR
Matriculated	Ethnicity	IR

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

Matriculated	Pell/loans/financial	IR
Matriculated	Incoming GPA	IR
Matriculated	OSU cumulative GPA	IR
Matriculated	SAT scores	IR
Matriculated	ACT scores	IR
Matriculated	TOEFL	IR
Matriculated	Degree type sought	IR
Matriculated	Options	IR
Matriculated	Participation rates in first year experience courses	IR
Matriculated	Students who shifted into the degree from another degree within OSU	IR
Applicants	Admit rate (admit to apply)	IR
Applicants	Yield rate (matric to admit)	IR
Applicants	Denied to applied ratio	IR
Degrees and certificates earned	Annual	IR
Degrees and certificates earned	By campus (Ecampus, Cascades, Honors)	IR
Licensure pass rates		Academic Unit
Time-to-degree	Mean	IR
Time-to-degree	<4 yrs, 4-6 years, 7+ years	IR
Retention Rate	1 year	IR
Retention Rate	2 year	IR
# of credit hours by graduation		IR
Total Enrollment	Term, Annual, by Type	IR
Graduation Rate	4 year, 5 year, 6+ year	IR

Faculty (where feasible, report headcount and FTE)

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Instructional faculty/student ratio		IR
SCH/faculty/year		IR
Advisor/student ratio		Academic Unit
Gender		CORE
Citizenship		CORE
Ethnicity		CORE

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

Rank		CORE
Tenure status		Academic Unit
Peer reviewed publication citations		Academic Unit
Grants and contracts	Number	Academic Unit
Grants and contracts	Award amount	Academic Unit
Patents		Academic Unit
Other scholarly works		Academic Unit
Awards		Academic Unit
Professional development		Academic Unit

Curriculum and Student Learning

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Aggregate eSET scores for program		Academic Unit
Program student learning outcomes		Academic Unit
Course to program SLO map		Academic Unit
Summary of assessment of SLO, discoveries, decisions		Academic Unit
Courses	Frequency taught	IR
Courses	Last term taught	IR
Courses	Taught by rank/type	IR
Courses	By Major and non-major	IR
Courses	Indicate BaccCore/WIC	IR/ Academic Unit
Courses	Campus	IR
Courses	Course designators	IR/ Academic Unit
Courses	Courses not taught but in catalog	Registrar
Courses	Courses removed in past 10 years	Registrar
Course access	Frequency of offerings	IR
Course access	Campus offered	IR
Course access	Enrollment versus capacity	IR
Course access	Electives	Academic Unit
AAC&U “high impact” practices	1 st year seminars & experiences	Academic Unit
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Learning communities	Academic Unit
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Service/community based	Academic Unit

Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Guidelines
v. 08–31–2018

	learning	
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Study abroad	Academic Unit
AAC&U “high impact” practices	UG research	Academic Unit
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Internship	Academic Unit
AAC&U “high impact” practices	Culminating experiences	Academic Unit
Annual assessment report summary	All years a report is submitted	Academic Unit /SharePoint
Description of curriculum management process		Academic Unit
Articulation agreements/curriculum guides		Academic Unit /SharePoint

Facilities

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Rooms controlled by department	Number by type	Academic Unit
Rooms controlled by department	Space utilization rate	Campus Planners/ Academic Unit
Total capacity	Square footage	Campus Planner/ Academic Unit
# people per room		Campus Planners/ Academic Unit
Enrollment per room		Campus Planners/ Academic Unit
Computing and technology	Current assets	Academic Unit
Computing and technology	Availability to students	Academic Unit
Computing and technology	Student use	Academic Unit

Budget

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Operational expenditures		Academic Unit
Revenue		Academic Unit
Actual and % change of budget		Academic Unit

General

ITEM	Sub-ITEM	SOURCE
Organizational chart		Academic Unit
National rankings		Academic Unit

APPENDIX 3: Reviewers' Report Template

1. Overall Recommendation:

- Expand
- Maintain
- Restructure
- Reduce
- Suspend
- Discontinue
- Other (include brief explanation)

2. Objective, Logistics and Participants for this Review Process

This section serves as an introductory summary of the review process.

- a. Objective of the review and brief summary of the logistics of the site visit
- b. Overview of Program (brief description)
- c. Participants in the site visit

3. Detailed Program Evaluation and Assessment

This is the main body of the report, identifying strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the program and provides a rationale for each recommendation. The subsections of the report may vary depending upon the unit and nature of the program being reviewed.

- a. Programmatic Strengths
- b. Programmatic Weaknesses
- c. Programmatic Challenges

4. Summary of Findings (inputs of resources and outcomes of program performance)

- a. Undergraduate Degree Programs Offered (Mission of the program, and its relationship and alignment with the mission of the academic college(s), and that of the University)
- b. Administrative Structure (Quality of organizational support)
- c. Faculty (Quality of personnel and adequacy to achieve mission and goals)
- d. Students (Recruitment and enrollment trends of students, admissions selectivity and other indications of selecting high quality students)
- e. Facilities and Resources (Level and quality of infrastructure)
- f. Degree Program Structure, Courses, Curricular Innovations
- g. Program Assessment Practices (Curriculum and assessment strength)
- h. Outcomes and Impacts (Student learning outcomes and assessment of learning, placement and success of graduates, satisfaction of students and graduates with their education, Professional or national rankings/ratings, etc.)
- i. Key Issues

5. Recommendations

This section serves as the foundation by which the program will develop its Action Plan, with the identified strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the program providing a rationale for each recommendation suggested by the Review Team.

6. Conclusions

APPENDIX 4: Signature Sheet for Self Study Report

In signing this document, I (as Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair) indicate that all faculty members in the academic program under review have had an opportunity to participate in the development of this Self-Study Report and review the final document.

Name/ Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair

Date

APPENDIX 5: Signature Sheet for Action Plan

In signing this document, I (as Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair) indicate that all faculty members in the academic program under review have had an opportunity to participate in the development of this Action Plan and review the final document. Additionally, the signature of the Dean indicates that the Dean has reviewed the final Action Plan document and discussed it with the Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair for this program.

Name/ Program Coordinator, Head, Director, or Chair

Date

Name/Dean

Date