

**Program Reviewer's Response Form**  
**Academic Program Review- University Policy 2224**

**Program Reviewed:**

**Review Date:**

**Years Reviewed:**

---

**Purpose**

While many academic programs undergo discipline-specific accreditation reviews, programs without external accreditation require this internal review process to ensure quality, effectiveness, and continuous improvement. Program self-assessment is conducted regularly for many programs as part of the accreditation process and guided by specific guidelines from a discipline-specific accreditation agency. For academic programs at Louisiana Tech University for which no accreditation agency provides guidelines, the following program evaluation documentation and review are required.

A self- assessment study will be prepared by the unit head and the program faculty. The self-assessment study will be required for these programs every five years. This study will be reviewed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning. The program reviewer will provide recommendations to the program and to the University regarding the assessment process, program goals, learning outcomes, curriculum, faculty, and resources.

The review of program(s) should consist of a narrative report which:

1. describes all the graduate and undergraduate degree program offered,
2. analyzes their strengths and weaknesses, and
3. proposes actions to improve the programs.

This narrative should be a brief self-examination of the degree program offered, but not of the department as a whole. Detailed information should be placed in appendices. The body of the report should be 20 to 40 pages plus appendices.

## **Instructions**

As a program reviewer, you will:

1. Review the program's self-assessment document
2. Evaluate each section using the criteria provided in the rubric
3. Complete the Program Reviewer's Response Form by summarizing key areas for evaluation
4. Provide feedback and recommendations in a narrative form

## **Areas for Evaluation**

- I. **Relationship to the Program to the College and University Mission**
- II. **Student Demographics**
- III. **Program Curriculum**
- IV. **Program Outcomes and Documentation**
- V. **General Education Requirements** (if applicable)
- VI. **Faculty**
- VII. **Faculty and Student Interaction**
- VIII. **Facilities and Support**
- IX. **Program Strengths and Weaknesses**
- X. **Future Actions to Improve the Program**

## Rubric

Program Review Area	Unsatisfactory (1)  Three or more of the Satisfactory indicators are not met.	Acceptable (2)  One or two of the Satisfactory indicators are not met.	Satisfactory (3)	Above Average (4)	Outstanding (5)
<b>I. Relationship of Program Mission &amp; University Alignment</b>			Mission statements for all levels are provided. Clear description of how the unit's mission relates to college and university missions. Mission addresses teaching, learning, and where appropriate, research and public service.	All of Satisfactory plus: Mission is widely disseminated with evidence provided. Mission clearly drives program decisions.	All of Above Average plus: Exceptional alignment across all levels with compelling evidence of how mission guides all aspects of the program.
<b>II. Student Demographics &amp; Analysis</b>			Complete five-year enrollment and graduation data. Thorough analysis of enrollment trends. Evidence that faculty use student data in curriculum planning.	All of Satisfactory plus: Detailed action plans addressing enrollment/graduation trends. Evidence that previous actions have led to improvements.	All of Above Average plus: Exemplary data analysis with innovative strategies that have demonstrably improved program metrics.
<b>III. Program Curriculum</b>			Clear explanation of curriculum organization. Appropriate sequencing of courses.	All of Satisfactory plus: Curriculum clearly builds competencies across levels. Innovative learning experiences demonstrated.	All of Above Average plus: Exemplary curriculum design with clear evidence of continuous improvement based on assessment.

<b>IV. Program Outcomes and Documentation</b>			Complete Curricula Effectiveness Surveys for all major courses. IE Audits included and complete. Evidence of faculty involvement in outcomes assessment.	All of Satisfactory plus: Clear process for using assessment results for program improvement. Outcomes are widely shared with stakeholders.	All of Above Average plus: Exemplary assessment system with compelling evidence of using results for continuous improvement.
<b>General Education Requirements (GERs). Select N/A if program does not provide GERs. N/A</b>			Clear alignment of GERs with unit mission. Expected Learning Outcomes for GERs identified. Standardized assessment across all sections. Evidence of data collection across delivery modes.	All of Satisfactory plus: Detailed analysis of GER assessment data. Evidence of using results for GER improvement.	All of Above Average plus: Exemplary GER assessment with innovative approaches to improvement based on data analysis.
<b>VI. Faculty</b>			Complete faculty rosters provided. Clear mechanisms for ensuring teaching quality. Appropriate faculty evaluation system described.	All of Satisfactory plus: Evidence of robust faculty development activities. Assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness.	All of Above Average plus: Exceptional faculty development program with evidence of impact on student learning.
<b>VII. Faculty and Student Interaction</b>			Clear description of student-faculty interaction opportunities. Appropriate advising system explained.	All of Satisfactory plus: Multiple high-quality interaction opportunities. Well-developed advisor training program.	All of Above Average plus: Exceptional student-faculty engagement with evidence of positive impact on student success.

<b>VIII. Facilities and Support</b>			Complete inventory of facilities and equipment. Comprehensive financial support information provided.	All of Satisfactory plus: Analysis of resource adequacy. Evidence of resource planning.	All of Above Average plus: Exceptional resource management with evidence of innovation in resource development.
<b>IX. Program Strengths and Areas for Improvement</b>			Clear identification of program strengths and weaknesses based on data in the report.	All of Satisfactory plus: Thoughtful analysis of strengths and weaknesses with reference to program goals.	All of Above Average plus: Exceptional analysis with innovative approaches to leveraging strengths and addressing weaknesses.
<b>X. Future Actions to Improve the Program</b>			Concrete improvement plans for next two years. Actions clearly connected to program assessment.	All of Satisfactory plus: Detailed implementation strategies with timeline and resources needed.	All of Above Average plus: Exceptional improvement plan with innovative strategies and clear metrics for success.

#### Summary of Findings:

Using the relevant questions below, provide a program summary:

## **Relevant Questions for Reviewer**

### **I. Relationship of the Program to the College and University Mission**

- Is the mission of the College clearly defined?
- How is the mission of the College published and disseminated?
- Is the mission of the College appropriate?
- Does the mission of the College relate clearly to the University Mission Statement?
- How does the mission of the College address teaching and learning and, if appropriate, research and public service?
- How does the mission of the College describe the distinctiveness of the College and its values?
- How does the program contribute to the College and University missions?

### **II. Student Demographics**

- Do the data suggest significant increases/decreases in enrollment rates?
- Has the unit analyzed these changes, if applicable, and suggested actions to address the issues?
- Does the response include an analysis of the extent to which actions taken have made improvements?
- Do the data suggest significant increases/decreases in graduation rates?
- Has the unit analyzed these changes, if applicable, and suggested actions to address the issues?
- Does the response include an analysis of the extent to which actions taken have made improvements?
- Do the admission requirements to the program appear to be reasonable?
- Do the levels of remediation/prerequisites (if applicable) appear to be reasonable?
- Do the levels of pre-baccalaureate preparation appear to be sufficient for reasonable success in the program?
- Does the unit appear to be responsive to current trends and curricular evolution?

- Does the unit describe a reasonable process in place to provide opportunities for faculty governance in planning the curriculum?
- Is there evidence to support the claim?
- Does the unit appear to have sufficient resources to sustain demand for the program?
- How does the unit assess demand for the program?
- Does the unit appear to have sufficient resources to sustain the demand for the program?

### **III. Program Curriculum**

- What evidence is provided to demonstrate how major-area courses build on each other?
- What evidence is provided to demonstrate how major-area courses differ in content and difficulty?
- Are the rationales for prerequisites, if they exist, explained clearly?
- If the program being evaluated is a graduate program, does the program clearly demonstrate rigor expected at the graduate level?
- Does the graduate program curriculum include knowledge of the literature of the discipline?
- Does the graduate program demonstrate student engagement in research and/or professional practice?
- What evidence is provided to document shared learning experiences?
- Is there documentation that these experiences are assessed?
- Did the program explain which courses are specifically designed to address oral and written skills as well knowledge of technology?
- Did the program demonstrate that degree programs reflect coherence in sequencing, increasing complexity, and linkages between and among program components?
- How does the institution ensure its graduate and post-baccalaureate students are engaged in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences?

### **IV. Program Outcomes and Documentation**

- Are the expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms for the program?
- Are the expected outcomes rigorous?
- Is there evidence of assessment activity?
- Do the sources of assessment represent a mix of qualitative, quantitative, summative and formative measures?
- How are the periodic reviews in which programmatic outcomes assessed, reviewed, and used for improvement?
- How do the proposed changes improve the program?
- Are the changes meaningful?
- Are faculty involved with setting and measuring of student learning outcomes, analysis of the data and use of the results for programmatic improvement?
- Are the goals and student learning outcomes readily accessible by faculty and students?
- Is there documentation/evidence to demonstrate of results being made available to students, faculty, and external stakeholders?

## **V. General Education Requirements**

- Has the program demonstrated a working relationship/governance in oversight with the General Education Committee?
- Has the program identified knowledge, skills, and attitudes in the courses that contribute to or support the student learning outcomes of the general education program?
- Has the program provided evidence of metrics used to demonstrate the extent to which the student learning outcomes are achieved?

## **VI. Faculty**

- Do all faculty appear to have the appropriate credentials and/or outstanding professional experience to teach the content at the level indicated?
- Are the faculty being provided appropriate opportunities for professional development?



- Is professional development included in annual faculty plans and evaluations?
- Does the documentation suggest that professional development opportunities are being used by the faculty?
- Are the faculty evaluated on quality of instruction?
- Are there development opportunities for adjunct faculty or dual-enrollment faculty?
- How does the institution support faculty professional development? This may include release time, direct funding, mini-grants, travel reimbursement, and the like.
- How are faculty members informed of professional development opportunities?
- Are there development opportunities for adjunct faculty or dual-enrollment faculty?
- Is there evidence that faculty are actively engaged in professional development activities?

#### **VII. Faculty and Student Interaction**

- Who advises students in the program?
- Is advising being provided by appropriately trained individuals in the program?

#### **VIII. Facilities and Support**

- Are there details available relating to classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other specific areas that address adequacy and appropriateness of facilities?

#### **IX. Program Strengths and Areas for Improvement**

- Has the program identified areas of strength and areas that need improvement to achieve continuous improvement?

#### **X. Future Actions to Improve the Program**

- Has the program explained the program improvements for the next two years focusing on changes that can be achieved informed by an analysis of earlier sections of the document?

**Recommendations:**

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for providing recommendations. It occupies the majority of the page area below the 'Recommendations:' header.