

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

**Prepared by
The Office of Research, Planning and Assessment**

*based on recommendations of the
Program Review Work Group, Spring 2001*

and

**Endorsed by
The Council on Institutional Effectiveness**

**Spring 2002
(Revised Spring 2008)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	<i>1</i>
History	<i>2</i>
Purpose of Program Review	<i>3</i>
The Review Process	
Part I. Calendar – Five-year Cycle	<i>3</i>
Part II. Funding	<i>4</i>
Part III. Timeline	<i>4</i>
Part IV. Components of Self-Study and Organization of Report	<i>5</i>
Part V. Peer Review	<i>6</i>
Components and Critical Questions	<i>6</i>
Section I. Academic Program Review	<i>7</i>
Section II. Administrative Unit Review	<i>9</i>
Appendices	
A. Five-year Calendar for Program Reviews	<i>11</i>
B. Funding Proposal Form	<i>13</i>
C. Program Review Checklist	<i>15</i>
D. Peer Review Process	<i>16</i>
E. Components of Program Review/Self Study	<i>20</i>
Notes	<i>22</i>

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the world of program review! For some of you this component of the institutional effectiveness program will need no introduction. For others who are unaccustomed to conducting a comprehensive self-study on a regular basis, program review will offer you new challenges – and new opportunities.

The emphasis here is on opportunities – and outcomes. Program review allows you and your department members to identify ways to do even better the things you are already doing well, new things that you wish to accomplish, and obstacles to improving programs, services and operations. While conducting your self-study, you will be able to make your own recommendations for how to achieve excellence by setting goals you hope to reach in the next five years (a long range plan). These goals can then be used to help formulate your annual institutional effectiveness plans – and to contribute to the strategic plan of the College. You can be assured that your vice president and dean/supervisor will review your goals, and the proposals for how to reach them, carefully. The Council on Institutional Effectiveness (CIE) will receive a report of the results of the peer review – an action plan based on the recommendations and worked out by the department/program in conjunction with the Dean/Supervisor and the Vice President. Also, the CIE will be eager to learn about later outcomes that reflect continuous improvement in your department or program.

How can you learn more? The following pages outline what the College is expecting in a program review and provide a framework for conducting the self-study. The Office of Research, Planning and Assessment will offer workshops to help clarify the process, utilizing the expertise of various people on campus who have experience with program review. The assessment staff will also be available to consult with individuals wanting more information and assistance. Feedback will always be welcome so that improvements can be made in the process as needed.

Join in the journey towards excellence. We talk with Meredith students about the importance of making a difference in the world. The program review process can help us equip our students to do just that. All members of the Meredith community are invited to join in this effort as we look for ways to be intentional about change – ways to renew and reinvigorate the important part you play in achieving excellence at Meredith.

COUNCIL ON INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (2007-2008)

Laura Davidson
Dr. Marilyn Dutton
Ann Gleason
Connie Harris
Dr. Jennifer Hontz
Dr. Jean Jackson
Sue Kearney, *Chair*

Dr. Allen Page
Dr. Margarita Suarez
Dr. Marie Sumerel
Bill Wade
Dr. Susan Wessels
Student Member
Terri Richards

HISTORY

So how did the program review process come about? In Fall 2000, the CIE approved the implementation of program review for all academic and administrative units of the College and authorized the creation of a work group to develop recommendations for how the process would work at Meredith. The Program Review Work Group (members listed on the next page) met throughout the spring of 2001, and presented its recommendations to the CIE for its consideration and approval. Additional time has been spent in developing guidelines, framing important questions to be addressed in the self-study, clarifying processes for peer review, and developing a calendar. This document provides guidelines for the entire Meredith community that should help facilitate a self-study and peer review process that will reap benefits for the department/school/program and for the College.

Is Meredith ready for program review? The CIE believes the time is right to implement this phase of the institutional effectiveness plan. In an article entitled “Evaluating Department Achievements: Consequences for the Work of Faculty” (Section: A Final Note) in the December 1999 *AAHE Bulletin* (found on the AAHE website), Jon Wergin, a professor of educational studies at Virginia Commonwealth University and an AAHE Senior Scholar, has written:

The way an institution sees itself is reflected in how it evaluates. Among the institutions we studied, those that were most successful with departmental and unit assessment took the long view: administrators took the time to develop a commitment to and an energy for change, and then looked to assessment to help move the change along. They charged each department with the responsibility of identifying and answering its own evaluation questions, and held each accountable for doing that effectively. They enhanced organizational motivation by sharing information and encouraging dialogue. Finally, they took seriously issues of data quality and credibility.

Clearly there is impetus for change and a commitment to assessment to help improve our programs, operations and services. The program review process puts responsibility on each academic and administrative unit to ask its own questions, as well as to assess its current standing. What we must do is keep the evaluation process and the conversation going and then use the findings to work for continuous improvement.

PROGRAM REVIEW WORK GROUP MEMBERS (2000-2001)

Marisa Campbell
Dr. Mary Ellen Clancy
Dr. Rosemary Hornak
Cheryl Jenkins
Sue Kearney, *Chair*
Alma Lane Lee

Laura McClain, *Secretary*
Dr. Reg Shiflett
Anita Gunn Shirley
Dr. Deborah Tippet
Bill Wade
Dr. Anne York

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review is a means for each academic program and administrative unit to:

- Assess its effectiveness at achieving its stated mission, goals, and objectives;
- Show the current state of the department/program and encourage critical questions about plans for change;
- Determine long-range and annual institutional effectiveness goals;
- Achieve continuous improvement in the quality of programs, activities, services and operations;
- Enhance learning outcomes by improving the quality of teaching, learning, research and public service in academic and educational support programs;
- Provide evidence of the excellence of Meredith's programs for the College community and to the wider community.

The program review should result in five-year goals for the department/school/program that can help drive the annual institutional effectiveness plans and help contribute to shaping and fulfilling the institutional strategic plan.

The goal is to ensure the pursuit of excellence in all areas, both academic and administrative, at Meredith College.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

Part I. Calendar – Five-year Cycle

All academic departments/programs and administrative units will conduct a self-study *every five years*.

For those departments/programs that have specific accreditation or approval associations reviewing their programs and operations, the self-studies will be scheduled to coincide with the outside program review whenever possible. The department or school may utilize the reports prepared for and received from the accrediting or approval agency. Those programs would need to provide responses to any additional questions that Meredith's guidelines might call for which were not examined by the agency involved and to give attention to long-range goals if the accrediting body does not include that component. However, the College will not require these departments/programs to duplicate efforts.

The process expects that approximately 12 – 15 academic and administrative departments will conduct a program review each year. **Appendix A** provides a schedule for the first five-year cycle and includes the pilot year (2002-03) that was used to help refine the process. **Appendix AA** projects the timeline for the second five-year cycle of program reviews, based on when initial reviews were completed. Also, a few additional areas have been included.

Part II: Funding

The College is setting aside some funding each year to help support the cost of program reviews. The funds allocated to a department or unit will need to be expended within the fiscal year for which they are granted. A typical program review will likely be funded at approximately \$2000, although the amounts allotted may run more or less depending upon the size and complexity of the department or program. An application for funding (see *Appendix B*) must be filed in the Office of Research, Planning and Assessment, with appropriate justification provided for all expenses. The decisions about funding will be made by the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment in consultation with the Vice President concerned.

A transfer of funds into the departmental/school/program account will be made only after receipts for expenses have been reviewed and approved by the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Any honorarium paid to an external peer reviewer will be sent only after the final report of the review team has been received.

Part III: Timeline

From initial planning to completion, a program review is expected to take approximately 12 – 18 months. A typical timeline for a program review follows.

Date	Action
<i>Initial Calendar Year</i>	
Spring	Plan the program review: Who will coordinate, participate in, and provide support? What topics, in addition to required components, are to be studied? When will various parts of the project be completed? What information is available and what will need to be generated? How will the peer review process be structured?
May 15	File a funding proposal in the Office of Research, Planning and Assessment (RPA). See <i>Appendix B</i> for the funding proposal form.
June 1	Each department/program will be notified of the amount approved for its program review.
June - May	Conduct the self-study, write the report, and complete the peer review process in spring or early summer.
<i>Ending Calendar Year</i>	
June 1	File a report, itemizing expenses and providing copies of receipts or purchase orders, with the Office of Research, Planning and Assessment (RPA). Funds will be transferred from the RPA office budget to the department's account before June 30. We recommend that the department set up a special account to which program review expenses will be charged, as the RPA office will transfer funds in a lump sum.
Within 1 Month	Review the report of the peer review team and clarify any questions about the report and/or recommendations.

By End of Next Semester

Work with the Dean / Supervisor, Vice-President and the Office of Research Planning and Assessment to establish a plan of action that will use the results of the review and recommendations to improve the program/operations and student outcomes/experiences. File a copy of the action plan with the vice president, dean/supervisor and with the RPA office. The vice president, dean/supervisor and the assessment staff will review the program review report, and the follow-up action plan, and will provide feedback/suggestions to the department/program if needed.

Results of the program review, including a copy of the action plan, will be shared with the Council on Institutional Effectiveness.

On-going

The self-study should result in long-range goals and should provide a strong basis for developing annual institutional effectiveness plans for the upcoming years.

And, finally, celebrate the successful completion of the program review process, take pride in what the unit is doing exceptionally well, and welcome the challenges presented by areas where programs, services, operations and outcomes can be improved!

See *Appendix C* for a convenient checklist.

Part IV. Components of Self-Study and Organization of Report

The Council on Institutional Effectiveness (CIE) has approved a listing of components that every self-study should include (see *Appendix E*). These **Components and Critical Questions**, with questions that should be asked and answered, are discussed in Section I for academic/educational support programs and in Section II for administrative units. The CIE has also endorsed the idea that **a department/program/unit is encouraged to raise additional questions that it wishes to study**. The College very much wants the program review to be of greatest value to those who are involved in the process and therefore encourages units to think beyond the guidelines.

In completing the examination of its programs and operations, each academic department/program and administrative unit should consult any professional standards that might apply, as well as the criteria outlined by the regional accrediting association and any other pertinent accrediting or licensing agency.

The self-study should result in a written report, together with any appropriate supporting documentation. A portfolio approach can be used, if desired. The report will be submitted to the vice president, your dean/supervisor and then to the peer review committee.

The following organization for self-study reports is recommended:

- Part I. Mission / Goals / Objectives
- Part II. Program Description and Analysis
- Part III. Operations and Resource Management
- Part IV. Evaluation / Assessment
- Part V. Strengths and Weaknesses
- Part VI. Actions to Improve Programs and Operations
- *****
- Part VII. Action Plan in Response to the Peer Review

Part V. Peer Review

When a self-study has been completed, a review by a group of peers must take place. The Council on Institutional Effectiveness has approved the following recommendations:

- That a team of two to three reviewers be used and that at least one of the reviewers be from outside the Meredith community;
- That vice-presidents of the divisions, in consultation with the dean/supervisor and department heads, will determine the make-up of the peer review team.

NOTE: “Internal reviewers” (i.e., colleagues within the Meredith community but outside the particular department/unit undergoing a program review) may be included as members of a peer review team.

See *Appendix D* for information about how peer reviewers and self-study coordinators will be instructed concerning the process and the criteria for evaluating program reviews.

COMPONENTS AND CRITICAL QUESTIONS

This area is divided into two sections. Section I covers Academic Program Review, while Section II covers Administrative Unit Review. Educational support programs that have student learning outcomes involved should pay attention to both sections.

The following basic questions should help guide the self-study, as the department / program seeks to present evidence of excellence in what it offers and as peer reviewers evaluate the resulting report.

- What are our goals and objectives – for students? ourselves? the institution?
- How well are we meeting them and how do we know?
- What can we do to improve?
- What is the value of what we offer to students? the division? the institution? the community?

Section I: Academic Program Review

The primary purpose of program review is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. This process provides an opportunity: to examine the curriculum, instructional strategies, administrative efficiency and resources; to identify strengths and areas for improvement; and to assess the overall effectiveness of the program(s) offered and of the department/school. The review should reflect continuous and on-going planning, information gathering, self-review, and the use of results for the purpose of improving student learning, as well as enhancing the curriculum and other learning experiences. A department / school may wish to use a portfolio approach in collecting and presenting information for its self-study.

A. Mission, Goals and Objectives

1. What are the mission and goals of your department / program? Do they link to the mission of the College?
2. How do the mission and goals relate to professional standards, when applicable?
3. Are learning objectives of the program(s) offered clearly identified? Are they expressed in terms of student learning outcomes?

B. Program Description and Analysis

1. What is offered? Identify programs, activities, and services offered.
2. Who is served? Identify student populations and other stakeholders served.
3. What are the trends (five-year patterns) in enrollment, graduation, licensing (when applicable) and job placement rates?
4. Is the curriculum appropriate and up to current philosophical and pedagogical expectations for each academic program offered? Have goals and objectives that address student learning outcomes been identified and stated? Are the requirements well defined and do course offerings have coherence? Is course sequencing appropriate?
5. Are special opportunities required of or afforded to students in the program? Are they adequately described and well-communicated to students? Are they carefully planned and evaluated?

Special opportunities include the following:

Experiential learning, service learning, research options, field trips, study abroad and/or semesters away, other (*e.g.*, departmental clubs, honor societies, performing groups, opportunities for professional involvement.)

6. What opportunities do faculty and staff members have for professional development? for research? for public service? What noteworthy contributions have been made to the scholarship of teaching and learning? to research in the field? to professional organizations? to the Meredith community? to the wider community?

C. Operations / Resource Management

1. How are financial resources allocated to accomplish the mission and goals?
2. How well do facilities, equipment, and the shared resources of the campus (*e.g.*, computer technology, library resources, campus services, the administration, etc.) support the work of the department/program?
3. What human resources are available to accomplish the work of the department/program? What are the qualifications of the faculty, staff and administrators? What leadership is available to ensure on-going attention to program direction and evaluation?

4. How involved are faculty and staff in the department/program? in the life of the Meredith community? in the wider community and in professional activities?
5. If there are particular legal, ethical and social responsibilities associated with the department/program, are these obligations being fully met?

D. Evaluation / Assessment

1. What changes and improvements have occurred as a direct **result of the last program review** completed?
2. What is the **strategic planning** process? What are the key steps and who are the key participants in the process? What the current strategic objectives and the longer-term objectives of your department/program? What evaluation strategies do you use to assess the extent to which the objectives have been achieved?
3. Concerning **educational outcomes assessment**, what student learning outcomes (skills knowledge, and disposition) are associated with the program's goals? What assessment methods are used to determine the extent to which current students and graduates have achieved these learning outcomes? What assessment information and data are gathered? What do they say about the extent to which the learning outcomes are achieved?
4. What **changes** (instruction, course, curriculum, student support, faculty development, *etc.*) have been made **to improve student learning**? How have the evaluation of strategic plans and the assessment of educational outcomes contributed to specific changes?

E. Other

All departments/programs have the opportunity to identify additional questions and issues of importance to them to be studied during the program review, and to include them in the report for peer review.

F. Strengths and Weaknesses

1. What are the areas of greatest strength for the department/program? Are there ways that the department/program can build on these strengths?
2. What are the areas needing improvement? Are there external threats or internal barriers that impede progress in these areas?

G. Actions to Improve Programs and Operations

1. Are there steps to improve that have already been taken as a result of current the self-study? (Have you included improvements resulting from the last self-study in the assessment portion of your report?)
2. What recommendations/plans has the department/program formulated as a result of the current self-study?

Section II: Administrative Unit Review

The primary purpose of program review is to enhance the programs, activities, services and operations of the administrative unit. This process provides an opportunity: to examine the current programming, strategies, administrative efficiency and resources; to identify strengths and areas for improvement; and to assess the overall effectiveness of the programs and services offered and of the department. The review should reflect continuous and on-going planning, information gathering, self-review, and the use of results for the purpose of improving. An administrative department may wish to use a portfolio approach in collecting and presenting information for its self-study.

An educational support area that provides programs involving student learning outcomes should also consult the previous section on academic program review in completing its self-study.

A. Mission, Goals and Objectives

1. What are the mission and goals of your department / program? Do they link to the mission of the College?
2. How do the mission and goals relate to professional standards, when applicable?

B. Program Description and Analysis

1. What is offered? Identify programs, activities, and services offered.
2. Who is served? Identify student populations and/or other stakeholders served.
3. Are special opportunities afforded to students through this department? Are they adequately described and well-communicated to students? Are they carefully planned and evaluated?
Special opportunities include the following:
Experiential learning (including student work positions), volunteer or service learning, field trips, etc.)
4. What opportunities do staff members have for professional development and involvement? for public service? What noteworthy contributions have been made to professional organizations? to the Meredith community? to the wider community?

C. Operations / Resource Management

1. How are financial resources allocated to accomplish the mission and goals?
2. How well do facilities, equipment, and the shared resources of the campus (e.g., computer technology, library resources, campus services, the administration, etc. support the work of the department/program?
3. What human resources are available to accomplish the work of the department? What are the qualifications of the staff and administrators? What leadership is available to ensure on-going attention to program direction and evaluation?
4. How involved are staff members in the department/program? in the life of the Meredith community? in the wider community and in professional activities?
5. If there are particular legal, ethical and social responsibilities associated with the department/program, are these obligations being fully met?

D. Evaluation / Assessment

1. What changes and improvements have occurred as a direct **result of the last program review** process?
2. What is your **strategic planning** process? What are the key steps and who are the key participants in the process? What the current strategic objectives and the longer-term objectives of your department/program? What evaluation strategies do you use to assess the extent to which the objectives have been achieved?
3. What **changes** have been made **to improve the programs, activities and services** of the unit? How has the evaluation of strategic plans contributed to specific changes?

E. Other

All departments/programs have the opportunity to identify additional questions and issues of importance to them to be studied during the program review, and to include them in the report for peer review.

F. Strengths and Weaknesses

1. What are the areas of greatest strength for the department/program? Are there ways that the department/program can build on these strengths?
2. What are the areas needing improvement? Are there external threats or internal barriers that impede progress in these areas?

G. Actions to Improve Programs and Operations

1. Are there steps to improve programs and operations that have already been taken as a result of the current self-study? (Have you included improvements resulting from the last self-study in the assessment portion of your report?)
2. What recommendations/plans has the department/program formulated as a result of the current self-study?

Appendix A

Seven-year Calendar for Program Review (Cycle One)

Outlined below is the schedule for self-studies and peer reviews that have been or are in progress to date.

2002-03 (Pilot year)

Academic Advising	Campus Ministry
Volunteer Services	

2003-04

Admissions	Social Work, in conjunction with CSWE re-accreditation
Chemistry, Physics, Geoscience	Teaching Fellows Program, in conjunction with the NC Teaching Fellows Commission Visit
Communication	

2004-05

Counseling Center	Honors Program
Facilities Services	Psychology
Faculty Development	Sociology
23+ Program	Student Activities and Leadership Development

2005-06

Athletic Programs, in conjunction with required NCAA self-study	Library
Campus Police	Mathematics/Computer Science/Computer Info. Systems
Dean of Students	Paralegal Program, in conjunction with ABA re-approval calendar
English	Religion and Philosophy
Foreign Languages and Literatures	Study Abroad
Health, Exercise and Sports Science	Undergraduate Research
Human Resources	

2006-07

Art	Financial Services
Biology and Health Sciences/ Environmental Studies	History and Political Science
Career Center	Interior Design, in conjunction with CIDA visit
Dance and Theatre	Learning Center
Family and Consumer Sciences/ Child Development/ Fashion Merchandising and Design/ Foods and Nutrition (UG + MSNut), Dietetic Internship Program	Music (UG and GR)

2007-2008

Education (UG + MED), in conjunction with NCATE/SDPI visit	Postal Services
Copy Center	Registrar's Office
Financial Assistance	School Of Business
General Education	Teaching Fellows Program, in conjunction w/ NC Teaching Fellows Commission visit
Health Services	

2008-2009

Marketing and Communications	Service Learning
Research, Planning & Assessment	Sponsored Programs

Appendix B

Funding Proposal Form

Date: _____

Department/School/
Program: _____

Begin Date: _____ End Date: _____

Coordinator: _____

Phone Number: _____

Account Number: _____

NOTE: Each unit undergoing a self-study will have a special line account established that ends with the numbers 64547.

Total Amount
Requested: _____

NOTE: A typical program review will likely be funded at approximately \$2,000, although the amount allotted may run more or less depending upon the size and complexity of the department/school/program.

Description: Describe how program review will be conducted. What are the major expenses (e.g., supplies, extra support staff hours, travel expenses for external reviewer, travel expense to visit other colleges, honorarium for external reviewer)?

Itemize major activities and expenses to be incurred for the program review.

<u>Activity/expense item</u>	<u>Projected cost</u>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
TOTAL REQUESTED	\$_____
Signature _____	Date_____

Please submit this form by May 15 to the Office of Research, Planning and Assessment.

Appendix C
Program Review Checklist

Advance Planning Process

- Hold planning session(s) with VP and dean/supervisor to discuss the scope and structure of the program review.
- Decide who will coordinate the self-study and who in the department/school/program will participate.
- Decide who will provide support in completing the program review.
- Decide what topics are to be studied.
- Decide what information is available and what will need to be generated.
- Consult with Director of Institutional Research and Assessment to understand how the budget/program review account works and how things should be charged.
- File a funding proposal in the Research Planning and Assessment (RPA) Office.
- Develop a timeline for completing various parts of the project and identify who is responsible.
- With the help of the VP and your dean/supervisor, determine who will serve as peer reviewers and who will chair the team.

Self-Study Process:

- Review and Update Mission, Goals and Objectives.
- Provide program description and analysis.
- Provide documentation of data or statistics.
- Review operations / resource management.
- Include in your assessment the changes / improvements that have resulted from the last self-study.
- Review, update and improve your strategic plan and, when applicable, your educational outcomes.
- Identify any additional questions and issues of importance.
- Identify departmental or program strengths and weaknesses.
- Generate departmental / program recommendations and long-range plans.
- Provide the VP, dean/ supervisor, and Director of Institutional Research and Assessment a copy of the completed self-study report.

Peer Review and Follow-up Process

- Provide to peer reviewers the self-study report and include a packet, provided by the RPA Office, that contains reviewers' responsibilities and evaluation criteria.
- Have an initial meeting/conversation with the chair of the peer review team to decide if additional information is needed and with whom, when and how interviews with students, faculty, etc. will occur.
- Make any advance arrangements needed for peer review team.
- Arrange time for an initial meeting with the peer review team.
- Arrange exit interview with the peer review team to gain feedback and to insure understanding by the peer review team on the remaining responsibilities and time frame for reporting.
- File an expense report of all program review expenses with Director of Institutional Research and Assessment before end of fiscal year.
- Submit a copy of the peer review report and recommendations to the VP, dean/supervisor, and Director of Institutional Research and Assessment.
- Meet with the VP and dean/supervisor to discuss responses to recommendations and develop a written action plan. Provide a copy of this plan to the VP, dean/supervisor, and Director of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Appendix D

Peer Review Process

A peer review is an essential step in the program review process – one that should provide valuable feedback and recommendations that will benefit the department / school or administrative unit. The following points will help clarify the expectations and the procedures to follow.

- Knowledge, evaluative skills, objectivity, and respect for confidentiality are all important traits to look for in a peer evaluator. A list of on-campus resource people will be developed and posted on the Research, Planning and Assessment web site. Such a list should be helpful to department/program heads and deans in formulating a peer review team if an internal reviewer is to be used.

NOTE: Meredith faculty and staff members will usually be asked to participate in no more than one program review per year.

- The vice president, the head of the department/school/program undergoing a review and their dean/supervisor will select the peer review team and name one of the members as the Chair. The guidelines recommend that a team of two to three reviewers be selected and that at least one of the members be an external reviewer from another institution or professional organization.
- The department head, dean/supervisor or vice-president will communicate with the peer review committee members to arrange for the on-site review. The on-site peer review will be conducted over one to two days. An outside reviewer will have any compensation specified in the letter; travel expenses will be covered and in most instances an honorarium will be appropriate.

NOTE: The College views participation on a peer review team as an opportunity for professional development. On-campus reviewers are typically not compensated, although the home department may wish to acknowledge the contribution of one of its members in some way.

NOTE: The Director of Institutional Research and Assessment will provide a packet to be sent to peer reviewers along with the self-study report to clarify expectations and criteria for evaluation (see below).

- The vice president, the head of the department/school/program undergoing a review or their dean/supervisor and the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment will send letters of appreciation to all individuals who serve on a peer review team.

Responsibilities of the Program Review Coordinator (department/school/program head or someone else in the unit designated to lead the self-study)

Prior to the on-site review

- Lead the department/school/program in conducting a thorough self-study as described in these “Guidelines for Program Review.” The self-study will result in a written report and any documentation needed to support the program review.
- Work with the vice president and dean/supervisor to identify a qualified peer review team and to invite the members to participate, and to name a chairperson for the team.
- Provide a copy of the self-study to the vice president, dean/supervisor and to the director of institutional research and assessment for their review.
- Send a copy of the self-study report, any appropriate documentation and the peer review packet of information, provided by the RPA Office, to the peer review team members.
- Collect any additional information and schedule any interviews requested in advance by the peer review team.
- Make or confirm any necessary travel arrangements for reviewers from other institutions or professional organizations.
- Arrange a meeting space/headquarters for the peer review team and anticipate what equipment/resources might be needed during the visit.

During the on-site visit

- Coordinate the schedule and facilitate the visit of the peer review team while it is conducting the on-site visit.
- Provide additional information or resources that the peer review team may need.
- Meet with the team as needed/requested.
- Arrange a final meeting with the peer review team, including anyone who should be present to hear the exit report.

Following the peer review evaluation

- Review the report and recommendations of the peer review team and raise any clarifying questions about the report, either verbally or in writing.
- Process the expense reports filed by team members expeditiously and make certain that they are reimbursed for their expenses.
- Meet with the vice president and your dean/supervisor to discuss the program review and to work out an action plan for implementing any of the recommendations (those made by the department/program/school or by the peer review team) that are deemed appropriate by the vice president, dean/supervisor and the department/school/program.
- Celebrate!

Responsibilities of Peer Reviewers

Prior to the on-site review

- Review these “Guidelines for Program Review” to learn what the academic or administrative department/school/program has been asked to do in its self-study and to cover in its report.
- Review the self-study report and any accompanying documentation compiled by the department/school/program undergoing program review. A peer review team will receive a copy of the self-study report 15 to 30 days before the planned on-site review.
- Inform the department head (or other self-study coordinator) at Meredith of any information that appears to be lacking which the review team would like to have available.
- Identify any particular people, including student groups that the reviewers would like to interview during the on-site review.
- Work with the department head (or other self-study coordinator) to make or confirm any necessary travel arrangements.

During the on-site visit

- Meet at the beginning of the on-site visit to determine / finalize plans for conducting the evaluation and writing the report.
- Hold conversations with members of the department and other people on campus.
- Review any additional documentation that was not part of the original self-study report provided to the peer review team in advance of the visit.
- As needed, schedule touch points throughout the visit so that the team can share questions or themes that are arising which may need to be explored further.
- Hold a final team meeting either to draft or develop the framework of the report and to identify any recommendations that will be made by the review team.
- Meet with the department/school/program personnel, dean/supervisor and the vice president to report on the strengths and weaknesses found during the peer review and the recommendations of the team.

Following the peer review evaluation

- A written report, including any recommendations, will be prepared and sent to the vice president, the department/school/program head, the dean/supervisor, and the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. The report should be filed within three weeks of the site visit.
- Answer any follow-up questions the department/school/program has about the report or recommendations.
- File an expense report with the department/school/program head within 15 days of the visit.

Peer Review Criteria

The peer review team should use the following questions as a checklist when evaluating the program review completed by a department or program and in preparing its report.

- Has the department/school/program satisfactorily completed a comprehensive self-study, as defined by the College?
- Have all components and questions identified by the College been addressed?
- Have other issues of particular importance to the department/program (if any were identified) been addressed adequately?
- Do the mission and goals of the department/program relate to the mission and goals of the College?
- Are the goals and objectives clear and explicit?
- Is there on-going evaluation of programs, operations and services? Is there evidence of continuous improvement?
- Where applicable, is appropriate assessment of student learning objectives taking place? Is there evidence that assessment results are used to improve student learning outcomes?
- Have long-range goals / ways to improve been identified by the department or program and included in their program review report?
- Does evidence indicate that resources are used wisely in the implementation of programs, activities and operations?
- Has the self-study been conducted objectively by the department?
- Have the recommendations by the peer reviewers been made independently of influence from the person or persons going through the program review?
- Are there recommendations or suggestions the review team wishes to make that might further strengthen the department or program involved in the program review?

Appendix E

COMPONENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW / SELF-STUDY

What every self-study should include:

Mission / Goals / Objectives

- How they link to mission of the College

- How they relate to professional standards (when applicable)

Programs Description and Analysis

- What's Offered (programs, activities, services)

- Who's Served

Organization and Administration / Management

- Human Resources / Reporting Structure

- Written Policies, Procedures, Processes

- Personnel Evaluation Process

- Professional Development Opportunities

Department / Program Resources

- Facilities

- Equipment

- Financial Resources / Budget

- Leadership/Program Direction

- Faculty / Staff Involvement

- Qualifications of Faculty, Staff, Administrators

Shared Resources / Support

- Administration

- Computer Technology

- Campus Services (*e.g.*, copy center, facilities services, security, food

 - services, library etc.—will vary by area according to what support is needed)

Campus, Community, and Professional Relations

Legal, Ethical and Social Responsibilities

Evaluation / Assessment

- Strategic Planning (long-range and short-term)

- Outcomes Assessment (long range and short term)

- Major Changes / Use of Results – including improvements resulting from last program review

Other

All programs and administrative units have the opportunity to identify questions/issues of importance to them to be studied during the program review process.

Components particular to academic / educational programs:

Curriculum

- Goals and Objectives that Address Student Learning and Program Outcomes
- Course Offerings that have Coherence
- Course Sequencing / Articulation

Special Opportunities

- Experiential Learning
- Field Trips
- Study Abroad and/or Semesters Away
- Service Learning
- Other (*e.g.*, departmental clubs/honor societies/performing groups, opportunities for professional involvement, etc.)

Scholarship of Teaching

Research Opportunities

Community / Public Service

Enrollment and Retention

Outcomes of Graduates

- number/percent completing program
- job placement information
- graduate school information
- other (*e.g.*, scholarships for graduate study, awards, etc.)

NOTE: Academic departments/programs and administrative units should consult professional standards and criteria outlined by SACS and any other pertinent accrediting agency in the examination of its programs and operations.

RECOMMENDED ORGANIZATION OF SELF-STUDY REPORTS

Part I	Mission / Goals / Objectives
Part II:	Program Description and Analysis
Part III:	Operations
Part IV.	Evaluation / Assessment
Part V.	Strengths and Weaknesses
Part VI:	Actions to Improve Programs and Operations

Part VII:	Action Plan in Response to the Peer Review

Approved by Council on Institutional Effectiveness – April 18, 2001
Subsequent Revisions in Program Review Policy Subject to Approval of the CIE

NOTES