



## **PROGRAM REVIEWER'S RESPONSE FORM**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW  
University Policy 2224

Program Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Instructions Provided to Colleges to Conduct the Program Review**

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 of the graduate and undergraduate degree programs 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 programs 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. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify departments of the programs and timetable for review.

The department will submit an electronic copy of the completed report to the Dean who will forward the document to the Provost/Office of Academic Affairs for distribution to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning.

The following pages provide the guidelines for preparation of the comprehensive program review.

**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. These questions are derived and adapted from the SACSCOC *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*” to ensure that these programs receive an adequate review.

These guidelines have been prepared as a series of questions that might be asked by reviewers to assist them in determining the Program’s effectiveness related to each section and subsection of the Program Review outline.

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.”

The information in Table 1 provides an example of a reviewer’s response to one of the items in the Program Review which did not provide a satisfactory response.

Table 1: Examples of Reviewer Responses

Review Item #1:	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?
STATUS:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Satisfactory</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Needs Clarification</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</b>	Documentation demonstrates that faculty participate fully in planning and implementing the curriculum. Faculty wishing to introduce a new course submit a proposal to the College’s Curriculum Committee. The line of approval for a special topics course goes to the Council for Academic Deans and to the President. A special topics course must be submitted as a “new” course to IPC (undergraduate) and the Graduate Council (graduate) after it has been offered three times and the level of interest, sustainability, and relevance to the program have been adequately demonstrated. Additionally, faculty participate in assessment of the program’s curriculum and use of results for improvement, as documented in minutes of the College’s Curriculum Committee.

Review Item #2: Describe the process used to regularly monitor and assess the quality of the program relative to the overall goals of the program and the learning outcomes.

STATUS:  Satisfactory

Needs Clarification

Unsatisfactory

**REVIEWER COMMENTS:**

The process used to monitor and assess the program is described thoroughly, and evidence points to a regular cycle of assessment. However, the process assesses only overall goals. No evidence is provided to demonstrate assessment of learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The program administrators and faculty need to develop strategies to assess student learning outcomes for the program.

Review Item #3: Describe how assessment results have been used in the recent past to improve the program goals, learning outcomes, curriculum, faculty, or resources.

STATUS:  Satisfactory  
 Needs Clarification  
 Unsatisfactory

**REVIEWER COMMENTS:**

Documentation is provided to demonstrate that assessment has occurred and results have been collected. Evidence of use of the results for improvement is implied but no specific examples have been given.

Recommendation: The program administrators and faculty need to document specific examples of use of results for improvement and subsequent assessment of the outcomes of those improvements (i.e., close the assessment loop)

**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:*

*1-4. Give the mission of your unit, relating it to both the College mission statement and the University mission statement.*

Located at <https://www.latech.edu/administration/policies/p-1103/>.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

This section should demonstrate the context of the academic unit in the College’s mission and the University’s mission. The responses should evaluate the program's contributions to the College and to the University.

- 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?

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

**II. Relationship to Other Programs**

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

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

This section should demonstrate the role, scope, and level of the unit’s contributions to

interdisciplinary opportunities, to general education requirements, to programs in other units and colleges, etc.

- Does the program provide links to other programs in the unit? In the College? In other colleges?
- 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?

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

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 provide courses to other programs in the unit? In the College? In other colleges?
- Do the relationships appear to be sustainable (in terms of workload, physical/human resources)?
- Does the response address issues of governance in oversight of the relationships?

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

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 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?

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

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:

- Has the program demonstrated governance in oversight of the links?
- Has the program demonstrated that the links are sustainable in terms of workload, physical/human resources, etc.

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

**III. Student Demographics**

1-2. Provide five-year enrollment and graduation figures.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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?

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

<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</b>

3-5. Describe the quality of their academic preparation for the degree.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

This section should demonstrate the admission requirements, required remediation/prerequisites (if applicable), standards for progression through the program, capstone requirements (if applicable), and other milestone activities.

- 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?

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

6. 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? Is there evidence to support the claim?

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

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

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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?

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

#### IV. Program Curriculum

1. For each academic program you offer,

- Explain how the major is organized: Are there core courses that all majors take? Does the curriculum have options within it?
- Did the program provide the most recent curriculum sheet?

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

2-4. Explain how major-area courses at various levels – freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior – are designed to build on each other and how the content and difficulty of the courses differ at the four levels. If there are prerequisites for courses, explain the rationale for those prerequisites.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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?

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



<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</b>

5. Explain the extent to which students in the program share learning experiences in their major fields. Explain how the program is designed to allow or enable the students to learn together.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- What evidence is provided to document shared learning experiences?
- Is there documentation that these experiences are assessed?

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

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 explain which courses are specifically designed to address oral and written skills as well knowledge of technology?

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

7. Does the curriculum have a culminating experience such as a capstone course, comprehensive exam, research project, or dissertation? If so, what is the content and focus?

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

--

8. Does the program have any service learning components? If no, please go to next question. If yes, please explain the role within the program.

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

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

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

**V. Program Outcomes and Documentation**

1. Did the program complete a Curricula Effectiveness Survey for each academic course? (This does not need to be completed for GERs or electives.)

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

2. Did the program attach the two most recent completed Institutional Effectiveness Audits?

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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?

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

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:

- Are faculty involved with setting and measuring of student learning outcomes, analysis of the data and use of the results for programmatic improvement?

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

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 and students?
- Is there documentation/evidence to demonstrate of results being made available to students, faculty, and external stakeholders?

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

GERs (Summarize program's response):

- a. How are GER courses infused within the Mission Statement of the academic unit?

- b. Provide the Expected Learning Outcomes that are used to measure GERs offered in the unit.

- c. How have the Expected Learning Outcomes and Means of Measurement been standardized across course sections? Explain.

- d. How is the unit

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

- e. How will or has the unit analyzed the data to make improvements in the GERs? (If you have begun reporting this on the IE Audits), you can reference/attach those in Appendix C; however, if that has not been fully implemented by the time this report is due, please explain the process to be used. Give specifics and examples.

**VI. Faculty**

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

*1. List the major subject subdivisions in your program, listing the faculty who teach in those areas.*

*For each faculty member listed above, and drawing from information collected in the Instructional Rosters,*

- *Indicate if faculty member is full-time or part-time.*
- *List the highest degree attained, the name of the university awarding the degree, and the field in which the degree was awarded.*
- *If the faculty member teaching undergraduate courses does not have a master’s degree with 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching field, briefly describe outstanding professional experience and demonstrated contributions to the teaching discipline.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Do all faculty appear to have the appropriate credentials and/or outstanding professional experience to teach the content at the level indicated?

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

*2. Describe the mechanisms used in your 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 Instructional Technology or University Louisiana System, 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:

- 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?

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

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

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Are the faculty evaluated on quality of instruction?

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

**VII. Faculty/Student Contact**

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

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

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

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

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

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

**VIII. Facilities and Support**

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

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

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 and a projection for the coming year.*

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

**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’s strengths and weaknesses.

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

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

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

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

**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.*

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