



## 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"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Clarification <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</b>	
<p>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</p>	

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  
                   X  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  
                   X  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. Give the College mission statement, relating it to the University Mission Statement (located at <https://www.latech.edu/administration/policies/p-1103/>).

<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>		

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

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 issues as shared requirements and interdisciplinary activities.

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>		

### III. Student Demographics

*For each academic program you offer, describe the students in the program.*

1. *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>		

2. *What is the student demand for the program?*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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>

3. *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>		

4. *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>		

--

**IV. Program Goals and Curriculum**

1. *List the goals, and desired learning outcomes of the program, telling what students are expected to know and what skills they are expected to demonstrate. For reference, the Curricula Effectiveness Survey, “Expected Outcomes for All Tech Graduates,” (<http://www.latech.edu/administration/policies-and-procedures/2224.shtml>). This information can be provided in a matrix.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Are the student learning outcomes identified in measurable terms?
- Do the student learning outcomes address knowledge, skills, and attitudes/dispositions?
- Does the chart/matrix identify where the knowledge, skills, and attitudes/dispositions occur 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>		

2. *Describe how the above goals are communicated to faculty and students. Indicate how faculty are involved in the development of these outcomes and how these outcomes are communicated to faculty and students through courses, presentations, and organizations. If external stakeholders are involved in the development process, please describe their participation.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Are the goals and student learning outcomes readily accessible by faculty and students?
- Is there documentation/evidence to demonstrate faculty involvement in the development of goals and student learning outcomes?
- If external stakeholders are involved, is there documentation/evidence to demonstrate their involvement in the development of goals and student learning outcomes?

<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. 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?

<b>STATUS (mark one box):</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>
		<b>Needs Clarification</b>
		<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</b>		

- 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>		<b>Satisfactory</b>
		<b>Needs Clarification</b>
		<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>REVIEWER COMMENTS:</b>		

- 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>		

- *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>		

**V. Documentation**

1. *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. Identify the stakeholders and how and when they are consulted.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- What is the evidence for broad-based participation in assessment activities?
- How are periodic reviews in which programmatic outcomes (such as retention, graduation rates, employer and alumni satisfaction, and the like assessed, reviewed, and used for 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>		

2. Present evidence of the **extent** to which the curriculum/program/major field goals are being met. List the sources of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative. Suggested measures for evaluating academic programs include the following: (NOTE: All may not be applicable to your academic unit):

- senior projects or theses for undergraduate programs,
- standardized tests,
- comprehensive oral and written examinations,
- analyses of theses,
- portfolios,
- completion rates,
- graduate school attendance rates,
- external review of theses/dissertations,
- annual review of student progress, especially for graduate students,
- exit interviews and graduating surveys,
- external awards and accomplishments and competitions,
- student satisfaction levels,
- job placement rates,
- evaluations by employers,
- follow-up studies of alumni,
- assessment reports or minutes from advisory boards or other external review agencies such as previous SACSCOC Assessments.

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?

<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. Critically analyze/review information and data collected about the curriculum. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for this curriculum. Report strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities identified. Present your analysis of these data in the text; include the specific evidence in the Appendix.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Are the data collected sufficient to provide meaningful and broad-based assessment of the curriculum?
- Is the analysis meaningful?
- Have appropriate opportunities for improvement been identified?

<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>		

**VI. Prior Assessment and Development of the Program**

1. *Describe how assessment results have been used in the recent past to improve the program goals, learning outcomes, curriculum, faculty, or resources.*

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- Does the documentation indicate that assessment results are collected on a regular basis?
- Does the evidence demonstrate that the results have been analyzed and used to improve 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 the implications of the findings, particularly as they relate to needed changes in the curriculum.*

<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>		

- Describe how you will use the information you have collected and analyzed, outlining changes to be made based on the evidence collected; such changes might include developing new courses, deleting courses, and adding special topics.

Relevant Questions for Consideration:

- 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>		

**VII. Faculty**

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

- 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, 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>		

**VIII. 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>		

**IX. 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>		

**X. Program Strengths and Weaknesses**

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>		

**XI. 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>		