



LOUISIANA TECH
UNIVERSITY®

PROGRAM REVIEWER’S RESPONSE FORM

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
University Policy 2224

Program Reviewed: _____

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Instructions for Reviewers of Program Reviews

The following *General Guidelines for Reviewers* are provided to assist reviewers in assessing the information provided in the Program Reviews. The structure of the Program Review form provided to the Colleges and the questions/requests appear here in italics. A section for the reviewers, entitled “Relevant Questions for Consideration,” has been inserted under the italicized question/request.

Reviewers should determine if the responses provided are satisfactory, need clarification, or unsatisfactory. In each instance, reviewers should provide a concise explanation of the decision, especially for the responses, “needs clarification” and “unsatisfactory/incomplete.”

I. Relationship of the Academic Unit to the College and University Mission

Evaluate the program's contributions to the College and to the University. In this section, include the following information:

- 1. Provide a description of how the College Mission relates to the University Mission.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- Is the mission of the College clearly defined?
- Does the mission of the College relate clearly to the University Mission Statement?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. *Provide a description of how the Unit's Mission relates to the College Mission.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- Is the mission of the College appropriate for and linked to the program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

3. *Provide the location(s)/links where the unit's mission is published and disseminated.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How is the mission of the College published and disseminated?
- Is it easily accessible?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

4. *Provide a description of how the unit's mission addresses teaching, learning, and if appropriate, research and public service.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How does the mission of the College address teaching and learning and, if appropriate, research and public service?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

II. Relationship to Other Programs

1. *Describe the links between this program and others within the department, the College, and the University. Include such items as shared requirements, interdisciplinary activities and so on.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Does the program provide links to other programs in the unit? In the College? In other colleges?
- Does the program describe the shared requirements, interdisciplinary activities, etc.?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. *Discuss the relationship between your unit and other units which may require courses from your unit – for instance, for minors and for content course for teacher training.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Does the program describe the relationship to other programs in the unit? In the College? In other colleges?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

3. *Discuss the extent to which students from other disciplines take courses in your field to satisfy GER requirements and how you think these courses are suitable for that purpose.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Has the program discussed the extent to which GER courses are offered in the unit?
- Has the program discussed the if these are suitable for this purpose?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

4. Discuss governance in oversight of these links and if these links are sustainable in terms of workload, physical/human resources, etc.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Do the links appear to be sustainable (in terms of workload, physical/human resources)?
- Does the response address issues of governance in oversight of the links?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

III. Student Demographics

1. For each academic program offered,
 - a. provide five-year enrollment and graduation figures (report data for leading summer quarter through following spring quarter),
 - b. describe the quality of students' academic preparation for the degree, and
 - c. how does the unit assess demand for the program?

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Has the program provided requested data?
- Has the program analyzed and discussed students' academic preparation for the degree?
- Has the program provided how it assesses demanded for the program and provided data relative to demand of the program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

--

2. *Analysis of the Data:*

- a. *Do the data suggest significant increases/decreases in enrollment and graduation rates?*
- b. *Has the unit analyzed these changes, if applicable, and suggested actions to address the issues?*
- c. *Does the response include an analysis of the extent to which actions taken have made improvements?*
- d. *Do the data suggest significant increases/decreases in graduation rates?*
- e. *Has the unit analyzed these changes, if applicable, and suggested actions to address the issues?*
- f. *Does the response include an analysis of the extent to which actions taken have made improvements?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Has the program analyzed enrollment trends, provided suggestions if issues have been identified, and provided a description of results if actions have been taken?
- Has the program analyzed graduation rate trends, provided suggestions if issues have been identified, and provided a description of results if actions have been taken?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

3. *Do the admission requirements to the program appear to be reasonable?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Do the admission requirements to the program appear to be reasonable and if not, an explanation was given?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

4. *Discuss any admission requirements that differ from the University admission requirements.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Do the differing admission requirements seem reasonable for the degree program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

5. *Does the level of pre-baccalaureate preparation (for undergraduate students) or baccalaureate preparation (for graduate students) appear to be sufficient for reasonable success in the program?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Do the levels of pre-baccalaureate/baccalaureate preparation appear to be sufficient for reasonable success in the program? If not, the program has analyzed the trends to identify potential issues.

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

6. *What is the roll of faculty in curricular development and maintenance? How is the information on students made available to faculty and used in planning the curriculum?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

--

7. Does the unit appear to have sufficient resources to sustain the demand for the program?

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Does the unit describe programmatic needs such as faculty, space, equipment, etc. that is based upon the data presented?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

IV. Program Curriculum

For each academic program offered, explain how the curriculum reflects program goals. In the description, focus on the structure of the curriculum, which includes the following items:

*1. Explain how the major is organized. **In Appendix A, attach the most recently approved curriculum sheet.***

- a. Are there core courses that all majors take?*
- b. Does the curriculum have options within it?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide an explanation of the curriculum?
- Did the program attach the most recent curriculum sheet?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. Explain how major-area courses at various levels – freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior; 1st year, 2nd year, etc., graduate programs – are designed to build on each other.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide a description of progression of coursework and how the lower level courses build to provide the knowledge and skill for the upper level courses?
- What evidence is provided to demonstrate how major-area courses differ in content and difficulty?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

3. *Are there any required remediation/prerequisites for the program?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide remediation/prerequisites?
- Are the rationales for prerequisites, if they exist, explained clearly?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

4. *Do the levels of remediation/prerequisites (if applicable) appear to be reasonable?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program identify if the remediation/prerequisites appear un-reasonable?
- Did the program provide an explanation/discussion of how the program foresees revising these?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

5. *Explain the extent to which students in the program share learning experiences in their program (e.g., group projects, lab assignments, etc.) and are able to learn together.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program have opportunities for shared learning experiences?
- What extent did students have to learn together?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

6. *Explain which courses in the major that are designed specifically to address oral and written skills as well knowledge of technology.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program address how oral and written communication skills are addressed?
- Did the program address how the knowledge of technology was addressed?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

7. *Are there any milestones (capstone, qualifying exams, comprehensives, etc.) that students must meet to progress in the program?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide any information if milestones must be met to progress in the degree?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

8. *Does the program have any service learning components?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program identify a service learning components and explain the role within the program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

9. *If the program being evaluated is a graduate program,*
- explain how the program clearly demonstrate rigor expected at the graduate level,*
 - infuses student engagement in research and/or professional practice within the program, and*
 - includes knowledge of the literature of the discipline.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program explain the rigor necessary for a graduate program?
- Did the program describe how research is used within the program?
- Did the program describe how literature of the discipline is used within the program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

V. Program Outcomes and Documentation

1. *In Appendix B: For each academic course in the major, please complete a Curricula Effectiveness Survey. Duplicate as necessary. This does not need to be completed for GERs or electives.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide a Curricula Effectiveness Survey for EACH academic course in the program?
- Does the chart/matrix identify where the knowledge, skills, and attitudes/dispositions occur in the program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

2. *In Appendix C: Attach the two most recently completed Institutional Effectiveness Audits.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide the last two completed years of Institutional Effectiveness Audits?
- Are the student learning outcomes identified in measurable terms?
- 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?
- Are the data collected sufficient to provide meaningful and broad-based assessment of the curriculum?
- Is the analysis meaningful?
- Does the documentation indicate that assessment results are collected on a regular basis?
- Does the evidence demonstrate that the results have been used to improve the program?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

3. *Explain how faculty are involved with setting and measuring of student learning outcomes, analysis of the data, and use of the results for programmatic improvement?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Is there documentation/evidence to demonstrate faculty involvement in the development of goals and student learning outcomes?
- Is there documentation that faculty participate in the analysis and use of results for programmatic improvement?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

4. *How are student learning outcomes and the results made available to students, faculty, and external stakeholders?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Are the goals and student learning outcomes readily accessible by faculty, students, and stakeholders?
- Are the student learning outcomes identified in measurable terms?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

For programs offering GERs, please complete the following section.

1. *How are GER courses infused within the Mission Statement of the academic unit?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide a description of how the GER courses are infused with the mission of the unit?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. *Provide the Expected Learning Outcomes that are used to measure GERs offered in the unit.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide learning outcomes?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

3. *How have the Expected Learning Outcomes and Means of Measurement been standardized across course sections?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Has the program standardized the Expected Learning Outcomes and Means of Measurement across the sections of each GER?
- Has the program provide an explanation?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

4. *How is the unit*

- collecting data,*
- ensuring a wide cross-section of students taking the GERs are being measured,*
- ensuring that main-campus, Barksdale, Academic Success Center, and online sections are all being assessed in the same manner, and*
- disaggregating the data based on mode and location of delivery?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Does the unit have a method for collecting the data?
- Does the unit have a method for ensuring an appropriate cross-sample of students are being measured?
- Is the program measuring all locations and modes of delivery?
- Can the program disaggregate the data?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

5. *How will the unit analyze the data to make improvements in the GERs?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Does the program have a plan to analyze the data?
- Does the program have a plan to use the data (or already used the data) to make improvements in the GER courses?
- Did the program provide specifics/examples?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

VI. Faculty

The intent of this section is to tie faculty to unit goals and discuss means of maintaining faculty expertise and quality.

1. *In Appendix D: Provide the last 2 years of Faculty Rosters.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide the last 2 years of Faculty Rosters?
- Do all faculty appear to have the appropriate credentials and/or outstanding professional experience to teach the content at the level indicated?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. *Describe the mechanisms used in the unit to ensure that each faculty member is "providing quality instruction for all classes assigned." Such mechanisms would include unit level seminars and meetings devoted to teaching and curriculum development, attending faculty development activities presented by the Center for Educational Excellence, attending subject area conferences, attending conferences and workshops focused on teaching, and competing for Summer Research Grants and Instructional Innovation Grants.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide a description of how it ensures that each faculty member is “providing quality instruction for all classes assigned?”
- 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?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

--

3. *How are faculty evaluated on quality of instruction?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide a description of how it quality of instruction is evaluated?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

VII. Faculty/Student Contact

1. *Describe any activities which promote student-faculty interaction, such as organizations, formal meetings, and informal counseling and other contacts.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide an explanation of how it promotes student-faculty interactions?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. *If faculty serve as academic advisors, describe how faculty are trained to be academic advisors in the program. If not, describe how advising occurs in the unit.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program describe how faculty are trained to be academic advisors in the program?
- If program faculty do not advise students, did the program describe how students are advised?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification

	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:	

VIII. Faculty and Support

1. *Identify the facilities (classroom, laboratory, studio) and equipment available to the program.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide an accurate description of the facilities and equipment?

STATUS (mark one box):	Satisfactory
	Needs Clarification
	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:	

2. *Report all financial support for the program, including operating funds, travel funds, equipment funds, support from student fees, funds for assistantships and fellowships, funds for student workers, and grant/gift income. Provide a three-year summary.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide a three-summary of the budget?

STATUS (mark one box):	Satisfactory
	Needs Clarification
	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:	

IX. Program Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Considering all of the above sections on students, program goals and organization, and faculty expertise, assess the program strengths and weaknesses.

1. *Identify areas of particular strength in program make-up, students, and faculty. Refer to information documented in this report.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Was the program able to identify strengths?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

2. *Identify areas that need improvement, again with specific reference to information given/documentated in this report.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Was the program able to identify areas for improvement?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

X. Future Actions to Improve the Program

Project any contemplated changes over the next two years to improve the program. Any changes should be those which can be achieved by the present or realistically-projected additional resources; any improvement dependent on additional resources should have those resources fully explained. Such resources might include increased enrollment, realistic changes in faculty, expanded budgets, higher admission standards, university recruiting changes, and grants or other outside funding that might be received.

This section should be grounded on the analysis in the earlier sections of this document.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Did the program provide project changes?
- Did the program provide needs for the future (resources, faculty, etc.)?
- Did the program fully explain the needs based upon the data?

STATUS (mark one box):	<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs Clarification
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory
REVIEWER COMMENTS:		

