

PROCEDURES FOR UNIT ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Linner Ward Griffin
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
Division of Academic and Student Affairs

Paul Gemperline
Acting Dean of the Graduate School
Division of Research and Graduate Studies

Linda Kean
Associate Professor and Director
School of Communication
College of Fine Arts and Communication

Michael J. Spurr
Professor
Department of Mathematics
Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences

George Bailey
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Philosophy
Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences

Mark Sprague
Associate Professor and Vice Chair of the Faculty
Department of Physics
Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences

Len Rhodes
Director, Institutional Research
Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research
Division of Academic and Student Affairs

Marianna Walker
Associate Professor and Chair of the Faculty
Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders
College of Allied Health Sciences

Phyllis N. Horns
Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences
Division of Health Sciences

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
Greenville, NC 27858

November 12, 2008
Revised, June 2010

(Faculty Senate Resolution #08-51)

UNIT ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The primary goal of the unit academic program review is to improve both undergraduate and graduate education at East Carolina University. Program review offers a way of achieving that goal by providing guidance to improve individual programs. This review document focuses on the forms of program evaluation supported by the Division of Academic and Student Affairs, the Division of Research and Graduate Studies, and the Division of Health Sciences:

- (1) On-site review
- (2) Outcomes assessment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROCESS OF REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Introduction

- Overview of Unit Program Evaluation at East Carolina University
- Participating Entities

Information for Faculty, Unit Graduate Program Coordinators, Unit Undergraduate Program Coordinators, Chairs, and Deans

- Unit Program Review Schedule
- A Guide to the Review Process for Faculty, Unit Program Coordinators, Chairs and Deans
- Flow Chart of the Unit Program Review Process
- Checklist and Timeline for Managing the Review Process
- Unit Program Self-Study Report Guidelines (Including Outcomes Assessment Guidelines)
- A Guide for Creating an Itinerary
- Biennial Reports on Action Plan Implementation

Information for Reviewers

- Flow Chart of the Unit Program Review Process
- Composition and Roles of Unit Program Review Committee
- The Unit Program Review Report
- Writing the Unit Program Review Report
- Travel and Expense Information for External Reviewers

References

Appendices for the Self-Study Report

- Appendix A. Graduate Faculty/Student Committees Chaired Over the Last 7 Years
- Appendix B. Student Placement
- Appendix C. Degree Program/Degree Concentrations
- Appendix D. Template for Faculty Sedona-generated CVs for the Self-study
- Appendix E. Biennial Progress Report Format

PROCESS OF REVIEW OF UNIT PROGRAMS

Introduction

Overview of Academic Program Review

The principles of academic program review, established at ECU, are the following:

1. Quality enhancement is an integral component of all ECU programs and is an expected outcome of program review.
2. Program review is an ongoing process that contributes to refining ECU's directions and program priorities, which then shape resource allocations and other governing decisions.
3. Every effort has been made to ensure that the key performance indicators used in program review are clearly stated, uniform, and disseminated with sufficient lead-time so that program faculty and administrators are aware of them before the review process starts. Program faculty may develop additional criteria that are unique to an individual program.
4. Program review is intended to provide helpful information through a process that is designed to be thorough yet not excessively burdensome to faculty and administrators. In this light, all programs within an academic unit would ideally be reviewed at the same time and the data collected and reported in the academic program review process will be that which has been collected in a systematic and routine manner and specifically for the purpose of this report.
5. A university-wide organizational framework for program review has been developed and will be consistently implemented. Program review is an integral part of each program and plays a major role in the university's ongoing assessment and strategic planning processes.

It is noted that effective unit academic program review at most institutions consists of a self-study conducted by each program, followed by a review by a committee comprised of academicians from both within and outside the university. The usual outcomes for such reviews are the identification of program strengths and weaknesses with a determination of overall program quality and specific recommendations for improvement. Peer-review, when properly done, is a very effective way to maintain and improve program quality if the university responds to the recommendations for improvement as suggested by the *Review Committee*. In addition, the periodic review could be used as a basis for a more effective allocation of resources by using the program quality metrics as indicated by the review.

All undergraduate and graduate programs are subject to the review process, although it is recognized that some programs and/or academic units at East Carolina University hold specialized accreditation. In these instances, the accreditation review process will substitute for the ECU Academic Program Review process outlined in this document for each accredited program.

The unit academic program review at ECU consists of two interrelated activities. The first is the **on-site program review**, which occurs approximately every seven years for each program (See [Timetable for On-Site Review](#)). The second is **outcomes assessment**, which is conducted on an ongoing basis. Collection and analysis of data related to outcomes, as well as resulting program changes, are reported to the program units. These two forms of program review are interrelated in two ways: (1) a description of the outcomes assessment plan and a summary of findings from previous assessments are included in the self-study for the on-site review and (2) in each report, faculty in the program are asked to record progress in implementing the action plan from the most recent on-site review.

The **review** process is comprised of six major components:

- (1) Self-Study prepared by the unit's undergraduate and graduate faculty
- (2) On-site review by a *Review Committee*
- (3) *Review Committee's* evaluative report and recommendations
- (4) Program faculty's response to that report with prioritized resource needs
- (5) Negotiation with the college/school to attain necessary resources
- (6) Action plan that provides the focus for a post-review meeting of the program chair, college/school, Graduate School, and university administrators

Outcomes Assessment: Three questions frame the work in any assessment program, which is evidence-centered. This approach provides a rich context and conceptual framework for considering assessments of student learning outcomes and for asking important questions about the types of claims that can be made based on assessments.

1. Claim: What do the faculty want or need to say about the student in the academic program?
2. Evidence: What does the student have to do to prove that he or she has the knowledge and skills claimed by the academic program?
3. Assessment Activities and Tools: What assessment tools and/or activities will elicit the evidence that the program needs about students knowledge and skills?

Participating Entities

All reviews will be conducted under the auspices of the Division of Academic and Student Affairs and, as appropriate, the Division of Research and Graduate Studies and the Division of Health Sciences, in conjunction with Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research and in cooperation with the individual unit programs under review and the dean of the College or School in which that program is offered. The review process will be jointly funded with the necessary EPA faculty, SPA staff, and operating costs by the deans, the Division of Academic and Student Affairs, the Division of Research and Graduate Studies, the Division of Health Sciences, and the Chancellor's Office. The roles of each participating unit are described below:

Division of Academic and Student Affairs

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs will function as the Coordinator for the review process and will manage all aspects of the review process. He/she will receive the Self-Study report from the program unit under review and distribute it to the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs or Health Sciences, and the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, if so indicated. In coordinating the individual program reviews, the Coordinator will: conduct the initial planning sessions with the chairperson, the unit undergraduate program coordinator (UUPC), the unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC), the dean (and/or his/her designee), and the faculty of the program under review (if requested by the unit chair); and ensure that the Self-Study is initiated in a timely manner. The Coordinator, working with the academic dean, chairperson and the UUPC and UGPC, is responsible for establishing the review schedule. After the review, the Coordinator will receive the report from the *Review Committee* and will coordinate the response plan meeting and the follow-up action plan report. The review committee report will be disseminated to the submitting chair, dean, Provost, other relevant vice chancellors, and to the Faculty Senate (Educational Policies and Planning Committee or EPPC).

Institutional Planning, Assessment and Research (IPAR)

IPAR produces the official data files for the university that are used in reporting to state, federal, and other externals to the university. Key performance indicators, for use by unit programs in the academic review process are produced from the official data files. The unit chair in conjunction with the faculty charged with writing and completing the program Self-Study will meet with the Executive Director of IPAR or an appropriate designee early in the unit's self-study process to discuss and outline requests for data sets necessary for program evaluation. IPAR will provide standard data (e.g., from Department Profiles; the University of Delaware Study of Cost and Productivity; summaries of major counts; student evaluation of teaching summaries; etc.) Some additional data may be provided by the school/college dean's office. Care must be taken to provide adequate data on both undergraduate and graduate programs when a joint review is undertaken. In some cases, the review team (see below) may request additional data. Reports will be provided to the units under review in a timely manner.

The College or School Having the Program Reviewed

The dean of the College or School (or designee) will participate in the initial planning of the on-site review, including providing a list of potential reviewers. The dean will meet with the *Review Committee* and participate in the exit interview. Following completion of the review, the dean will receive a copy of the *Review Committee's* report from the Coordinator and meet with the unit chair, the unit program undergraduate director (UUPC), the unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC), the dean of the Graduate School if appropriate, and the appropriate vice chancellors to develop a response plan for implementing the recommendations of the *Review Committee*. The dean, the Academic Council (Vice Chancellors of Academic and Student Affairs, Research and Graduate Studies, and Health Sciences if appropriate) must approve the Final Action

Plan prior to its implementation and provide the necessary resources outlined in the plan.

The Review Committee

The *Review Committee* will range from a minimum of three reviewers (one internal reviewer, one external reviewer focusing on undergraduate programs, and one external reviewer assigned to graduate programs) to a maximum of four reviewers (one internal reviewer, two external reviewers focusing on undergraduate programs, and one external reviewer assigned to graduate programs). The membership of the review committee will be dependent upon the levels (undergraduate and/or graduate), size, and complexity of the programs. The actual membership of the *Review Committee* will be decided jointly by the participating dean, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, and if appropriate, the Vice Chancellors for Research and Graduate Studies or Health Sciences.

Unit Offering the Undergraduate and/or Graduate Program

The unit chair is responsible for consulting with IPAR and for organizing unit faculty, following the procedures prescribed in the unit code, to write and complete the program Self-Study; he/she forwards copies of the report through the appropriate dean to the Coordinator. The unit chair will participate in planning the on-site review by recommending, through the dean, a list of suggested reviewers. Names of three internal reviewers will be submitted, along with names of a minimum of five external reviewers for undergraduate and five external reviewers for graduate programs from peer institutions. Additionally, the unit chair, after consultation with unit faculty, is asked to recommend the review dates and to help arrange the schedule of the review. The unit chair will meet with the *Review Committee*, and after the Review Committee Report is received, the unit chair and the unit undergraduate program coordinator (UUPC) and unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC) will: (1) work with the faculty to develop a Unit Response Plan; (2) meet with appropriate dean and vice chancellors to present the Unit Response Plan; (3) revise the Unit Response Plan and develop a Final Action Plan. The Coordinator will provide access to the Final Action Plan to the submitting dean, Provost, other relevant vice chancellors, and to the Faculty Senate (EPPC).

In interdisciplinary programs, the UUPC/UGPC should take responsibility for the actions listed above, but they should coordinate these actions with the appropriate chairs and deans.

Central Administration

The Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs, Research and Graduate Studies, and Health Sciences and the Chancellor, will provide staffing and funds for expenses and stipends. In addition, they will work with the unit programs to develop final action plans in response to the on-site review report recommendations and Faculty Senate (EPPC) recommendations.

Information for Faculty, Unit Undergraduate Program Coordinators, Unit Graduate Program Coordinators, Chairs, and Deans

Unit Program Review Schedule

Review Cycle

Each unit program should be reviewed on a predetermined cycle of once every seven years. For programs with professional accreditation, program reviews will follow the accreditation cycle. The details of this cycle (month and year of site visit) will be determined following consultation between the Coordinator, the Deans, and Vice Chancellors for Academic and Student Affairs and/or Research and Graduate Studies and Health Sciences. The deans, chairs or vice chancellors may request early reviews.

A seven-year program review schedule will be posted on the Office of Academic Programs, Graduate School, and the Faculty Senate web sites.

A Guide to the Review Process for Faculty, Unit Graduate Program Coordinators, Unit Undergraduate Program Coordinators, Chairs, and Deans

The objective of the formal review is to improve the program. The improvement is the result of two final products: (1) an internal evaluation involving self-study of the program by its faculty and (2) an on-site review conducted by a *Review Committee*.

The major steps in planning and conducting a formal review are outlined below (see also the *Flow Chart of the Review Process* and the *Checklist for Managing the Review Process*):

1. The unit faculty consult with the chair and select possible dates for the on-site review and propose external reviewers and internal reviewers (such as faculty from ECU's peer institutions who are familiar with the discipline; internal reviewers from a related campus-based discipline). Ideally, these arrangements are completed several months prior to the date of the on-site review. Invitations to external reviewers will be sent by the Review Coordinator. At about this same time, the Coordinator will set the date for a post-review meeting with program, college/school, Graduate School, and university administrators.
2. The unit faculty prepares a Self-Study (See Self-Study Guidelines). Unless otherwise specified by the unit code, the unit undergraduate program coordinator (UUPC), the unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC), and/or unit chair coordinate the preparation of the Self-Study document, but it is important to have broad-based input from the faculty. The Self-Study incorporates not only an analysis of data on incoming students, time to degree, attrition rates, etc. but also a summary of the program's outcomes assessment, quality enhancement,

corrective efforts to address any concerns identified in previous assessments, and the faculty's vision for the program's future. Hard copies and an electronic copy of the Self-Study should be sent to the Coordinator on or before the required submission date. The Self-Study will be disseminated to the *Review Committee* at least four weeks prior to the on-site review date.

3. The unit chair and/or the Unit Undergraduate Program Coordinator (UUPC) and the unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC) work with the Coordinator to develop the itinerary and location(s) for the on-site review meetings, which include meetings of the *Review Committee* with the unit program administrators, faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, college/school and division administrators, university and community constituents, and dean of the Graduate School over 2-3 days (See Guide to Creating an Itinerary).
4. The *Review Committee* conducts its review of the undergraduate and graduate programs. The committee organizes the first draft of the Review Committee Report before the external reviewers depart and then circulates drafts among members. An electronic copy and a signed hard copy of the final Review Committee Report should be completed and sent within 30 days after the review to the Coordinator, who will provide access to the unit program and college/school administrators.
5. Program faculty respond to each of the recommendations in the Review Committee Report, describing actions they will/will not take to implement the recommendations, who is responsible for the actions and when they will occur. Faculty also prioritize the resource needs that emerge from the recommendations. Then the UUPC, the UGPC, and the unit chair prepare a Unit Response Report and meet with college/school and division administrators to discuss funding of the program's top priorities.
6. After revising the responses to reflect actions to be taken by the college/school and divisions, the UUPC and UGPC, and/or chair develop a draft Final Action Plan based on the Unit Response Report document and disseminate the plan to the Coordinator and to participants in the upcoming Final Action Plan meeting.
7. At the Final Action Plan meeting, the UUPC, the UGPC, and unit chair summarize the program faculty's response. The college/school dean summarizes actions to be taken by the college/school. The UUPC, the UGPC, and unit chair revise the draft Final Action Plan to reflect any new actions that emerge from the meeting, and the Final Action Plan is forwarded by the Coordinator via email to the division vice chancellors, along with the Review Committee Report, and to all participating administrators on university, college/school and program levels and to the Faculty Senate (EPPC).
8. The Final Action Plan, along with the Self-Study, Review Committee Report, and the Unit Response Report, are housed in storage maintained by the Division of Academic and Student Affairs. The UUPC, the UGPC, and/or the unit chair report on progress toward full implementation of the action plan, explain any delays in or barriers to implementation. Where appropriate, the divisions will work

with the unit program and the college/school and university administration to overcome any obstacles to implementing the Final Action Plan.

Self-Study - Compiled by faculty and sent to college/school, Division of Academic Affairs, and Review Committee.

Program Review: Review Committee reads self-study, reviews program on-site; compiles preliminary review report; meets with administrators of unit program, college/school, graduate school

Ongoing Program Review & Enhancement: Program engages in implementation of activities & tasks in Final Action Plan. Essential to this process is completion of the Biennial Progress Reports

Review Committee Report: Provided to college/school, unit program, graduate school, faculty senate (EPPC), and division administrators.

Flow-Chart of the Unit Program Review Process

Revision of Final Action Plan: Revision of Plan to reflect resource negotiations; Coordinator provides access to post-review participants&Div.VC, chairs,deans,revelant VC & EPPC.

College/School and Unit Program Meeting:Unit program administrators meetw/grad school, divisions,college/ school to discuss resource priorities & their place in response plans; other funding sources?

Final Action Plan Meeting: Unit program administrators meet with administrators of the college/school, graduate school, and the divisions to discuss resource priorities, and to address resources needed.

Unit Response Plan: Unit faculty revise Unit Response Plan reflecting negotiations with college/school.

Program Response to Review Committee Report: Unit faculty respond to each recommendation with actions to be taken and the resources needed (prioritized) to implement recommendations; compile Unit Response Plan

Checklist and Timeline for Managing the Review Process

1. Unit undergraduate program coordinator (UUPC), the unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC), and unit chair, in consultation with the faculty, identify possible dates for review, external reviewers, and internal reviewer (Coordinator will invite reviewers). Program faculty begin to compile Self-Study. (*Minimum of 6 mo. in advance*)
2. Collaborating with the Coordinator, UUPC/UGPC begin to prepare for on-site review: create itinerary, make sure deans'/directors meetings are on their calendars, organize the various groups who will meet with reviewers, set up reviewers' room, etc. (*2 mo. In advance*)
3. UUPC/UGPC, chair, and dean send completed Self-Study to Coordinator, who distributes the document to the Academic Council, Graduate School, the Faculty Senate (EPPC), and the reviewers. (*4 weeks. in advance*)
4. *Review Committee* conducts review and drafts Review Committee Report. (*1 mo. after review*)
5. *Review Committee* sends final Review Committee Report to the Coordinator, who provides access to it to deans, chairs, relevant vice chancellors, and the Faculty Senate (EPPC). (*1 mo. after review*)
6. Unit program faculty respond to each recommendation in the report describing actions to be taken and resources needed to implement recommendations. Faculty prioritize the resource needs from the responses. Unit chair and UUPC/UGPC write Unit Response Plan. (*2.5 mo. after review*)
7. Unit and program administrators meet with college/school administrators to discuss the resource priorities and their place, if appropriate, and other sources of funding indicated in the Unit Response Plan. (*3 mo. after review*)
8. Unit chair and UUPC/UGPC revise the Unit Response Report to reflect discussions with the college/school and begin preparation of a draft of the Final Action Plan. (*3.5 mo. after the review*)
9. The Coordinator receives the draft Final Action Plan and distributes it to the Provost/Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs, and/or the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, and the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, college deans, school directors, Graduate School dean, unit chair, the Faculty Senate (EPPC), the UUPC, and the UGDP. (*4.5 mo. after review*)
10. Administrators from program unit, college/school, and the Graduate School meet with Division administrators to discuss resource priorities from the draft Final Action Plan. (*5 mo. after review*)

11. The UUPC/UGPC and unit chair revise the Draft Final Action Plan to reflect discussions in post-review meeting and sends the Final Action Plan to the unit, college/school, Faculty Senate (EPPC), and university administrators. (6 mo. after review)

Unit Program Self-Study Report Guidelines

Instructions

Designed for the seven-year review of undergraduate and graduate degree programs, the Self-Study described below should be completed by each unit program undergoing program review. The completed Self-Study should be submitted to the Coordinator at least six weeks before the *Review Committee* on-site review. The information submitted should follow the format below. Please introduce any additional information that you feel would be helpful in this review.

A major purpose of the seven-year review is to engage unit program faculty, other faculty inside and outside the University, the Divisions, and the Graduate School in thoughtful and creative study and evaluation of the overall program quality in relation to East Carolina University's mission and strategic directions for the period under review, and to the program's mission, vision --including the student learning outcomes that the program is designed to foster, and leadership. The review is intended to help faculty and administrators gain a clear understanding of the following:

1. The unit program's purposes and faculty activities to achieve these purposes within East Carolina University, including the program's outcomes (faculty expectations for students and the program)
2. The unit program's effectiveness in achieving these purposes and outcomes
3. The unit program's overall quality
4. The faculty's vision for the unit program, i.e., future aims for the program and any changes necessary to achieve those aims
5. The ongoing quality enhancement efforts undertaken by the specific academic program
6. In addition, the Unit may consider in its Self-Study other issues, which impact its operation.

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1.1 *Exact Title(s) of Unit Program:* Give title(s) exactly as indicated in the university catalog.

1.2 *Department or Interdisciplinary Group Authorized to Offer Degree Program(s):*

1.3 *Exact Title(s) of Degrees granted:* e.g., Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, Master of Science, Doctor of Education, etc.

1.4 *College or School:*

1.5 *Brief History and Mission:* Provide a brief history of the development of the unit undergraduate and graduate program(s). Briefly describe the vision and the mission of the program(s).

1.6 *Relationship of the Program to UNC's Strategic Goals and to the ECU Mission and to ECU's Strategic Directions* (Describe how each degree program relates to the UNC system's strategic goals, to ECU's mission, and to ECU's strategic directions.)

1.7 *Degree Program Objectives, Outcomes and Uniqueness:* For each degree program, list the objectives and outcomes (faculty expectations) from the unit's current assessment plan. Describe the breadth and depth of the program, and indicate special features or innovations.

1.8. *Program Enrichment Opportunities.* List and describe special events, activities and programs (e.g., lecture series) that enhance the academic and research/creative activity environment.

1.9 *Responsiveness to Local and National Needs:* Describe the nature of the discipline and the type of educational experiences provided by the degree program(s) in the unit. In what way is/are the program(s) responsive to the needs of North Carolina, the region and the nation?

1.10 *Program Quality:* Provide an assessment of the quality of the unit program(s) as compared to other programs in the Southeast and the rest of the nation, and explain the basis of the assessment. How does the unit program rank nationally? What is considered to be the best objective measure for national comparisons in the field? What award recognition has the program received?

1.11 *Administration:* Provide an organizational chart of the unit including all personnel. Briefly describe the program's administrative structure. List the major committees of the unit that relate to undergraduate and/or graduate education and their structure and function. Address leadership and describe any important formal and informal relationships the unit has with other units, institutes, centers, etc. at ECU and beyond.

II. CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

2.1 *Foundation Curriculum:* Indicate the contributions the unit program makes to the Foundations Program and foundation course cognate requirements of other units and the university. Describe the unit's quality enhancement process for Foundations courses. State the full-time equivalents (FTE's) utilized for Foundations courses and the student credit hours (SCH) produced per 1.0 FTE for each academic year under review. Describe the percentage of the unit's resources (funding, time, faculty, other) supporting Foundations courses per academic year under review and whether a greater or lesser amount of resources needs to be allocated to Foundations courses.

2.2 Instructional Relationship to Other Programs: Describe how instruction and research in this program supports or is otherwise related to other programs (undergraduate, graduate, professional) within unit and/or in other units or schools at East Carolina University. Cite other programs whose students frequently take minors or other program options with the unit's program. List courses in the unit program that are also required or are prerequisites within other degree programs.

2.3 Curriculum Assessment and Curricular Changes: Describe the assessment process and the metrics involved in measuring learning outcomes and implementing quality enhancement. Describe any significant changes in curriculum and instruction in the unit program as a result of the quality enhancement process or since the last self-study. Explain the reason for the changes, such as different needs of students, shifts of emphasis in the discipline, changes in faculty, perceived weaknesses in the program, problems with facilities, etc.

2.4 Bachelor's Degree: Describe the bachelor's degree curriculum, indicating the total number of required credits and the credit distribution among various units. If more than one concentration is available, then list the concentrations and their curricula separately. (Use Appendix C for this purpose.) If there is substantial dependence on some other unit program, describe and comment on the relationship between it and the unit's program. Indicate any associated professional certification. Include any additional information concerning curricular emphasis that would aid in characterizing the program as oriented to practice or training.

2.5 Certificate Programs: Describe the certificate curriculum, indicating the total number of required credits and the credit distribution among various units as in 2.4 above. If there is substantial dependence on some other unit program, describe and comment on the relationship between it and the unit's program.

2.6 Master's Degree: Describe the master's degree curriculum, indicating the total number of required credits and the credit distribution among various units as in 2.4 above. If more than one concentration is available, then list the concentrations or areas of emphasis and their curricula separately. (Use Appendix C for this purpose.) If there is substantial dependence on some other unit program, describe and comment on the relationship between it and the unit's program. Indicate any associated professional certification. Include any additional information concerning curricular emphasis that would aid in characterizing the program as oriented toward practice-training. Describe the research orientation of the thesis programs.

2.7 Doctoral Degree: Describe the doctoral degree curriculum, noting the credit and general distribution of requirements as in 2.4 above. When concentrations are offered, describe their curricula separately. (Use Appendix C.) Indicate whether the master's degree is required or usually completed before proceeding to the doctoral program and note the most common minor fields of study. Describe the preliminary examination requirements. Indicate any associated professional certification. Include any additional information concerning curricular emphasis that would aid in characterizing this program as oriented toward practice or research.

III. STUDENTS

3.1 *Enrollment*: Provide student credit hour data on unit degree programs and, as appropriate, on the unit's contribution to the Foundations Program. Assess the strength of student demand for the degree program and for courses in the Foundations Program. Utilizing appropriate data, comment on student enrollment trends in the degree program and as appropriate in Foundations courses. What are the implications of these trends for future unit planning?

3.2 *Quality of Incoming Students*: Comment on how evaluation and assessment of the quality of students in the unit's degree programs and, as appropriate in Foundations courses, is accomplished. Referring to appropriate data, comment on incoming student quality and trends over the past 10 years. What specific measures does the unit use to evaluate the quality of entering students? (For example, what use is made of the GPA or of standardized test scores?). Is the quality of the enrolling students as good as desired? What does the annual applications/acceptance ratio indicate about the quality of entering students and the faculty's standards of student quality?

3.3 *Quality of Current/Ongoing Students*: Are current students performing as well as desired? If not, what are the contributing factors? (Briefly refer to the findings of the outcomes assessment document, which is described in more detail in another section). Describe measures of student accomplishment (ex. major field tests, licensure scores, course-embedded assessment, etc.). List student recognition data such as research/creative activity publications and exhibits, campus awards, presentations, fellowships, and scholarships.

3.4 *Degrees Granted*: Using appropriate data, comment on the trends in the number of degrees awarded annually and the average length of time required to complete each degree program. What has been the trend in attrition over the past seven years? If attrition has been increasing, what measures, if any, have been taken to address that increase?

3.5 *Diversity of Student Population*: Provide student profiles relative to gender, age, minority, and international status. Describe plans to promote diversity.

3.6 *Need/Placement*: Comment on the strength of employers or others' demand for students with the knowledge and skills provided by the unit's courses. Describe past, present and future need for graduates from the program in the region, state, Southeast, and the nation. Cite any pertinent studies. Present data on the placement of students who have earned their degrees in the unit in the past seven years (Appendix B). Report those that have entered into graduate or professional schools. Report any information and data available on the level of employer satisfaction with unit graduates. Describe the level and kinds of assistance provided by the unit in placement of graduates.

3.7 *Funding*: Describe the scholarship and stipend support packages available for students and the approximate annual number of each type that have been received. Include Graduate Teaching Assistantships (GTA's), Graduate intern Assistantships (GIA's), and Graduate Research Assistantships (GRA's), fellowships, traineeships, etc. Include the number of semesters the average master's and doctoral student

spends on a GTA or GRA. How are GTA/GRA positions publicized, and how are students selected for those appointments?

3.8 Student Involvement in the Instructional Process: Indicate the degree of participation by students in formal or informal teaching activities within the unit and/or in other programs on campus. Describe any preparatory training and/or ongoing mentoring that undergraduate or graduate students receive.

3.9 Professional Development Opportunities: Describe any formalized research training that doctoral students in the unit receive. How are these training experiences supported, and how are students selected for them?

IV. FACULTY

4.1 Faculty List and Curricula Vita: As attachments to the Self-Study narrative, provide:

- a. An alphabetical list of faculty members, including the rank of each and the number of master's and doctoral advisory committees that each member has chaired during the past seven years, and
- b. A current, brief, Sedona-generated curriculum vitae for each faculty member covering the last 7 years. (See Appendix D).

4.2 Faculty Profile Summary: Provide summary data on: tenured/non-tenured, terminal/non-terminal degree, gender, minority, and international status. Describe hiring trends over the past 7 years and present hiring needs.

4.3 Visiting, Part-Time and Other Faculty: Describe the extent to which visiting and part-time faculty participate in the undergraduate and graduate programs. A list of graduate courses taught by adjunct faculty for the last seven years should be included. Also, if faculty members from other university units serve important roles in the program, please specify.

4.4 Advising: Describe how and when faculty advisors are assigned to students in the unit programs, as well as any guidance that new faculty are given in directing undergraduate/graduate student research.

4.5 Faculty Quality: Provide summary faculty productivity data such as: books, articles, exhibitions, performances, presentations, awards, grants, patents, service/outreach activities, number serving as theses advisors, number serving on theses committees, and number supervising honors and/or senior projects. Describe the ways in which the unit evaluates the quality of its faculty (e.g., teaching evaluations, peer review, publications, research grants, graduate students advised and their time to degree, etc.) and how it uses the results of these evaluations.

4.6 Faculty Distribution: Describe the faculty workload relative to teaching, research/creative activity, and service/community engagement. Is the unit staffed adequately to meet the needs of various fields of specialization in the discipline? If

not, please explain how the unit could achieve an appropriate distribution of faculty across specializations offered, given no growth in resources.

V. RESOURCES

5.1 *Budget*: Provide data for: the unit operating budget (expenditures), sponsored projects, F&A returns, fees, royalties, special services, assistantships, scholarships, etc.

5.2 *Space*: Describe scope, quality, and need-projections.

5.3 *Technical/Equipment Support*: Describe equipment and technical personnel support provided to faculty, staff and students.

5.4 *Library Support*: Provide assessment of library holdings and services related to the unit program.

VI. ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES/FACULTY EXPECTATIONS

Introduction

The material in this portion of the Self-Study should reflect the *continuous and ongoing* assessment of program outcomes: planning, information gathering, self-review, and use of results for improving the quality of the program.

Quality Enhancement Guidelines for Unit Programs

Outcomes assessment is a part of a broader shift in higher education. Traditionally, academics have taken an inputs-based perspective on what they do. That is, they have designated a set of courses and other experiences that students will have and simply assumed that graduates will possess the knowledge, skills, and other attributes we expect of them. *An outcomes-based perspective reverses that relationship.* Instead of beginning with inputs, one begins by defining the knowledge, skills, and other attributes that are expected of graduates—program outcomes—and then rethinks the curricula to better enable students to achieve the expectations the faculty have placed before them. Program outcomes, then, are a reflection of what faculty value for their students. Outcomes assessment is a way of determining how effectively the unit programs enable students to achieve unit program values. Outcomes assessment may be understood as a process of asking and responding to the following three questions.

6.1 What are the unit program values of the faculty, that is, the knowledge, skills, and other attributes faculty expect their graduates to attain?

Unit programs at East Carolina University have answered this question. Unit faculty have established broad objectives for their programs, typically related to the students' professional and career goals. For each of these objectives, unit faculty have identified outcomes by which they have defined their particular program's expectations for students' professional development and career goals. The unit provides objectives and outcomes for each program.

6.2 How well is the program achieving faculty expectations?

Units have generated plans for assessing their program outcomes: assessment data to be collected, the source of the data, how often the data are to be collected, and when the assessment results will be reported. Assessment plans are provided by the unit. Unit faculty are in the process of collecting and analyzing data and using the results to evaluate their programs.

6.3 What changes should be made in the program so that it can better achieve faculty expectations? What ongoing process does the unit utilize to promote quality enhancement?

This is the most important of the three questions, focusing on the goal of outcomes assessment: improving programs. Outcomes assessment provides data that unit faculty can use to identify aspects of the program that are not meeting their expectations and then to make decisions for improving the program. Continuous collection of data can provide unit faculty the information they need to determine the extent to which changes they have made in their programs are having the desired effect of improving outcomes. Summaries of what unit faculty have learned about their programs based on outcomes assessment and what changes in their programs they will make are given in their unit outcomes/assessment reports.

The Review Committee report (including its recommendations) will be shared with the academic unit to assist faculty in developing a planned quality enhancement procedure.

6.4 Assessment Reports

In order to document the efforts of unit faculty to improve their programs, each unit has instituted a report of the assessment of program outcomes and the actions taken in response to the key findings of those assessments. The report could consist of brief responses to a set of questions with an emphasis on summarizing as opposed to providing details of assessment results. Possible questions that units may be posing are:

- 6.4.1 What outcomes were scheduled to be assessed during the present reporting period? What outcomes were actually assessed? [Please refer to the unit program assessment plan].
- 6.4.2 What data were collected? Summarize findings for these data.
- 6.4.3 What did the unit program administration and the faculty learn about the program and/or the students from the analysis of the data? What areas of concern have emerged from the assessment?
- 6.4.4 As a result of the assessment, what changes, if any, have the unit program administration and the faculty implemented or considered implementing to

- address areas of concern? (These can include changes in the program and in the assessment plan.) How will the effectiveness of these changes be measured?
- 6.4.5 What outcomes are being planned for assessment for the upcoming reporting period? (If they are different from what have been proposed in the assessment plan, please update the assessment plan to reflect the change).
- 6.4.6 If the program has had an external review in the past 7 years, summarize progress in achieving the Final Action Plan for the most recent review (The Final Action Plan from the unit program can be obtained from the Office of Academic Programs). How many action items have been completed? What items have yet to be completed? Briefly describe plans for completing these items and/or obstacles to completion.

VII. CURRENT RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

7.1 Current Research/Creative Activity: Provide a brief description of significant ongoing research in the unit program. Indicate the major strengths or emphases of this research. Describe any unique programs that have national prominence. Describe three to five major research/creative activity accomplishments over the past seven years by faculty and/or graduate students in the unit and any new emphases planned for the near future (through new faculty hires, redirection of current faculty's research/creative activity, etc.)

7.2 National Comparison: Briefly describe how the research/creative activity effort in the unit compares to that in the discipline nationally in terms of focus areas and breadth of coverage.

7.3 Interdisciplinary Projects: What opportunities are there for carrying out interdisciplinary research/creative activity projects with other units on campus and with other universities, state or federal agencies, and industry? Are the present needs for interdisciplinary research/creative activity being accommodated? How successful are the efforts? Are there plans for increasing such efforts in the future?

7.4 External Research/Creative Activity Support: Evaluate the level of external funding for research/creative activity in the unit program. Comment on any trends. Is the unit program competing effectively for external support?

7.5 Research Development: What does the unit do to encourage and develop research/creative activity collaborations with faculty performing similar research/creative activities elsewhere in the university? Also, please describe deficiencies in facilities and resources that impede the unit's attempts to reach its objectives and any plans to address these deficiencies.

7.6 Ethics Training: Describe any education in research/creative activity and professional ethics that the unit program provides for its students. Such education could include courses, workshops, seminars offered by the unit program or by related programs or other appropriate experiences, such as the use of resources provided by the university.

VIII. SERVICE/OUTREACH

8.1 *Consulting*: To what extent are faculty involved in outside consulting work, paid and non-paid? Provide a quantitative and qualitative assessment of this type of work, and explain in what ways it contributes to the unit's program and to the mission of ECU.

8.2 *Community Service/Engagement*: To what extent is the unit's professional expertise made available to the community, state and nation through formal service programs, lectures, exhibits, public symposia, or concerts or through faculty service on governmental boards, scientific/professional associations, etc.? Evaluate the quality of this service, and indicate how it contributes to the unit's graduate instructional and research programs.

8.3 *Student Involvement in Community Service/Engagement*: To what extent are students exposed to formal or informal outreach activities?

IX. OTHER ISSUES FACED BY THE PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT (not covered above)

X. ACCREDITATION

If accreditation has been attained, provide the name of the accrediting agency, and indicate the date accreditation was granted and the frequency of accreditation review. If accreditation has been denied or has not yet been attained, describe the current status of the program in relation to gaining accreditation.

XI. SUMMARY COMMENTS AND VISION FOR THE FUTURE

10.1 Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the unit program(s) and the challenges and opportunities it faces in the foreseeable future. Indicate options for change and specific concerns that prevail.

10.2 Briefly describe the program's vision/strategic plan for the immediate future: Review the unit's major goals for the program(s) over the next five years, and describe their relation to the University's Strategic Plan and to a long-term strategy for resource allocation or reallocation.

A Guide to Creating an Itinerary for the Review

The *Review Committee* will review the Self-Study document before the on-site review takes place and identify the need for any additional information. A draft schedule for the review should be developed approximately five weeks prior to the on-site review by the coordinator, the appropriate chairperson and the unit program director following the general outline below:

Day 1

Review Committee meets together for dinner to share ideas and develop plans

that will guide the review. The Coordinator schedules this orientation dinner meeting.

Day 2

Review Committee meetings with central administration officials, the dean, the department chair, the UUPC, the UGPC, faculty members, program support personnel, and students are held. A tour of the facilities is usually given.

Day 3

Review Committee continues meeting with anyone not available on Day 2. *Review Committee* prepares a rough draft of their findings and reports to unit faculty and staff. Review Committee also holds an exit interview with the appropriate vice chancellors, deans, and unit program administrators.

NOTE: *The Coordinator handles the lodging arrangements, and payment and reimbursement of the external consultants. The unit under may provide local transportation.*

Biennial Reports on Action Plan Implementation

Because the purpose of the Program Review is to improve the unit's programs, it is important that there be follow-up on the implementation of the Final Action Plan that resulted from the review. To provide that follow-up, the UUPC/UGPC will report on progress toward full implementation through biennial reports.

The *sixth question* on the Unit Program Biennial Report concerns the implementation of the Final Action Plan. It is as follows:

If the unit program has had an external review in the past 7 years, summarize progress in achieving the action plan for the most recent review (The unit's action plan can be accessed from the Office of Academic Programs). How many action items have been completed? What items have yet to be completed? Briefly describe plans for completing these items and/or obstacles to completion. The UUPC/UGPC will respond to these questions on the Biennial Report in the second, fourth, and sixth years after the on-site review as long as any of the actions (by the program, college, or university) have not yet been implemented. In the seventh year when the next external review is scheduled, the UUPC/UGPC can use the archived biennial reports to summarize progress toward full implementation over the previous seven years when preparing the Self-Study for the next review. Biennial reports are submitted electronically to the Coordinator, who subsequently will provide web access to the appropriate dean, vice chancellor, and to the Faculty Senate (EPPC).

Biennial Reports and Final Action Plans on each program are archived and are available to UUPC/UGPCs from the Office of Academic Programs.

Information for Reviewers

Self-Study - Compiled by faculty and sent to college/school, Division of Academic Affairs, and *Review Committee*;

Program Review: *Review Committee* reads self-study, reviews program on-site; compiles preliminary review report; meets with administrators of unit program, college/school, graduate school

Ongoing Program Review & Enhancement: Program engages in implementation of activities & tasks in Final Action Plan. Essential to this process is completion of the Biennial Progress Reports

Review Committee Report: Provided to college/school, unit program, graduate school, faculty senate (EPPC), and division administrators.

Flow-Chart of the Unit Program Review Process

Revision of Final Action Plan: Revision of Plan to reflect resource negotiations; Coordinator provides access to post-review participants & Div.VC, chairs, deans, relevant VC & EPPC.

College/School and Unit Program Meeting: Unit program administrators meet w/grad school, divisions, college/school to discuss resource priorities & their place in response plans; other funding sources?

Final Action Plan Meeting: Unit program administrators meet with administrators of the college/school, graduate school, and the divisions to discuss resource priorities, and to address resources needed

Unit Response Plan: Unit faculty revise Unit Response Plan reflecting negotiations with college/school.

Program Response to Review Committee Report: Unit faculty respond to each recommendation with actions to be taken and the resources needed (prioritized) to implement recommendations; compile Unit Response Plan

Composition and Roles of the Unit Program Review Committee

Members

The actual membership of the *Review Committee* will consist of the following persons:

- (1) A minimum of one external graduate reviewer: Selected for expertise in graduate programs comparable to the one being reviewed.
- (2) A minimum of one external undergraduate reviewer: Selected for expertise in undergraduate programs comparable to the one being reviewed.
- (3) One Internal Reviewer: Senior member of the Faculty at ECU in a college/school other than the one in which the program under review is administered.

The external reviewers of both undergraduate and graduate programs should be from similar or more advanced programs in the same field of study.

The *Review Committee* will select its chair.

Reviewers Roles

External Reviewer

1. Provides the perspective of a senior faculty member in the discipline of the particular undergraduate/graduate program under review.
2. Makes his/her own travel arrangements. Furnishes the Division of Academic and Student Affairs with receipts necessary for expense reimbursement, as well as SSN and home address.
3. Contributes information to the *Review Committee*, the dean of the college/school, the dean of the Graduate School, and the vice chancellors that may be used to compare strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate/graduate programs (i.e., faculty, students, leadership, curricula, research, equipment and funding) to those of similar programs nationwide.
4. Works with other *Review Committee* members to write the Review Committee Report, which is begun during the on-site review; and, afterward contributes to revising drafts to produce the final Review Committee report.

Internal Reviewer

Provides the perspective of senior faculty member at ECU familiar with the institution and the needs and expectations of undergraduate and graduate programs. If requested, works with other committee members to draft and revise the written report.

Review Committee

The *Review Committee* presents a summary of their preliminary findings and recommendations (Review Committee Report) (a) during a meeting of unit faculty and staff and (b) at the exit meeting chaired by the Coordinator and attended by the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs or Vice Chancellor of Health Sciences, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, the dean of the Graduate School, and administrators of the college/school and the unit program. This session also provides an opportunity for the *Review Committee* to clarify some issues that will be addressed in the report.

Writing the Unit Program Review Report (Review Committee Report)

One of the primary responsibilities of the *Review Committee* is to produce a report based on a careful reading of the program's Self-Study and on what the committee members learn about the program during the on-site review. In order to be one that provides greatest benefit to the program, the Review Committee Report must be concise and to the point, usually 10-15 pages in length.

Review Committee Report Format

The Review Committee Report typically consists of three or four sections:

1. Program Overview. This section may include history, background, and administration of the program, providing some context for it. Material for this section comes from the unit program's Self-Study.
2. Program Strengths. The strengths related to faculty, teaching, research/creative activity, leadership, students, curriculum, etc. may be presented in bullet or paragraph format.
3. Areas for Improvement. Generally, these areas for improvement are given in bullet format describing weaknesses and providing indicators of each weakness from the data the reviewers gathered during the review.
4. Recommendations for Improvement. These recommendations may be presented as a list in a separate section or included after appropriate areas for improvement (in this latter case there would be only three sections of the report). Recommendations are the most important part of the review report because they become the basis for a plan of action for the program. Therefore, recommendations should be clear and concrete in their depictions of what faculty in the program (or the college or the university) should do to improve the program. It is helpful to organize the Areas for Improvement and Recommendations into categories, such as *Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Instruction, Research, and Facilities*.

Review Committee Report Writing Process

Writing the Review Committee Report involves all members of the *Review Committee*. The itinerary for the program on-site review should provide time for the *Review Committee* to organize a first draft of the report before the external reviewers depart.

The following is a possible scenario for writing the Review Committee Report:

1. Together the committee members discuss areas for improvement and one of the members makes a preliminary list of them.
2. Together the committee members discuss recommendations for each of the areas of improvement on the preliminary list. One member makes a preliminary list of the recommendations for the graduate programs, and another makes a list for the undergraduate programs.
3. Together the committee members arrange the areas for improvement and associated recommendations into appropriate categories, such as *Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Instruction, Research/Creative Activity, Service/Community Engagement, Resources, Leadership and Diversity, and University Support*.
4. The *Review Committee* divides the categories among the members and each member drafts descriptions of the areas for improvement and associated recommendations for his/her assigned categories.
5. The committee members read what they have written to each other (or display on a screen) and get comments for revision from the other committee members. They revise their sections.
6. Together the committee members discuss other areas for improvement and recommendations that should be added to the list and drafts them.
7. Together the committee members discuss strengths of the programs and one of the members makes a preliminary list. Together, the committee members compose the list of strengths in bullet form arranged in categories as appropriate.
8. The *Review Committee* composes a rough draft document in order for them to present their findings and recommendations to the unit's faculty and staff and to administrators during the exit interview.
9. After the on-site review, one committee member takes the rough draft and adds the opening Overview of the Program and revises the report for clarity, concision, and grammatical correctness. He/she sends the next draft to the other committee members.
10. The other committee members add their revisions and send them to the member with the original draft to incorporate those changes in the draft.

11. The process of revising and circulating drafts continues until all committee members accept a final draft.
12. The chair of the *Review Committee* will send an electronic copy and a hard copy (with the committee chair's signature) of the final draft of the report to the Coordinator, who will provide access to unit faculty and administrators.

The Unit Program Review Report

The report should place the program under review in the larger context of ECU's strategic priorities and of developments in the program's discipline. It should take account of the program's role within the university. It should address the major issues facing the program, comment on the compatibility of the program's purpose, achievements, plans and goals with those of the college and university strategic priorities, and suggest strategies for achieving program and university goals. To accomplish these purposes, the report should consider the following points as appropriate to the mission of the program:

1. *Competitiveness*

- Identify one or two programs at other institutions that may be similar to the program being reviewed.
- Identify one or two programs in other institutions that can serve as a model for future growth of the program being reviewed in the next five to ten years.
- In comparison to similar programs at other institutions, what are the program's strengths and weaknesses?
- What benchmarks should be used to measure the program's effectiveness and efficiency in the use of its resources?
- What will the program have to do to achieve or maintain national or regional competitiveness in the next decade?

2. *Undergraduate Program (if applicable)*

- How well is the program performing its undergraduate teaching function?
- Is there evidence that the program has clear goals on undergraduate student learning outcomes, assessment process(es) are in place, and that the results are being utilized?
- Are the program's admissions criteria appropriate?
- Do undergraduate students receive appropriate mentoring and advisement?
- Is the curriculum sound and sufficiently rigorous?
- Is the program properly staffed to fulfill its undergraduate responsibilities?
- Are classes the appropriate size to accomplish its teaching and learning goals?
- Is the program fulfilling its responsibilities to majors and non-majors with regard to the foundation curriculum initiative including first year experiences, study abroad, undergraduate research, service learning and other discovery learning programs, capstone course(s), distribution

requirements, multicultural courses, the Honors Program, and pre-requisites for other programs?

3. *Graduate Program (if applicable)*

- How effective is the program in performing its graduate teaching responsibilities?
- Is there evidence that the program has clear goals on graduate student learning outcomes, assessment process(es) are in place and that the results are being utilized?
- Is the research/creative activity and scholarly productivity of the program's faculty appropriate to its graduate responsibilities?
- Are the program's admissions criteria appropriate?
- Do graduate students receive appropriate mentoring and advisement?
- How successful is the program nationally and regionally in attracting qualified graduate students and placing graduate degree holders in professional employment?
- How competitive is the program nationally and regionally in attracting qualified graduate students and placing graduate degree holders in professional employment?
- Is the curriculum credible and appropriate for the discipline?
- Are students receiving faculty mentoring and assistance in finding professional employment?

4. *Faculty Research/Creative Activity*

- Are the research and creative activity of the faculty appropriate to the program's mission and overall responsibilities with regard to quality and quantity?
- Are research facilities, computer facilities, and library resources appropriate to support faculty research?
- Are faculty generating external funding to the degree that they might?
- What role are faculty playing in the university's research centers and interdisciplinary research groups?
- Are the faculty engaged in regional and national professional organizations?

5. *Faculty and Staff*

- How well are faculty and staff resources being used?
- Are promotion and tenure policies appropriate to the program's missions and aspirations?
- Is the program successfully hiring and promoting minority and women faculty?
- Are faculty and staff workloads equitable? Is the program's workload appropriate and consistent with the strategic priorities of the university?
- How does the program rank among those in similar institutions regarding research productivity and quality, external funding, and teaching loads?
- Are staff positions and expectations clearly defined?
- Does the program provide development and training programs to faculty and staff?

6. *Leadership*

- Does the program's leadership take appropriate and timely action to ensure the program's smooth functioning?
- Does the program's leadership interact appropriately with other university units, including the college dean's office?
- Does the program have an effective leadership development program in place?
- Does the program have a mission statement and long range plan that are endorsed by the faculty and that are used as the basis for annual planning?

7. *Service/Community Engagement*

- Is the program meeting its service/community engagement expectations?
- Is it performing a satisfactory amount of service/community engagement research and assistance?
- Is it, where appropriate, making the effort to introduce students to professional service/community engagement opportunities?

8. *Diversity*

- Is the program taking appropriate steps to meet the university's goals to achieve a diverse faculty, staff and student body, to offer multicultural courses, and to promote respect for all people?

9. *University Citizenship*

- Is the program providing good university citizenship?
- Do its members encourage and contribute to interdisciplinary activities?
- Should it concentrate its efforts and resources in a different way in order to create the greatest possible synergy throughout the university?

10. *University Support*

- Is the program receiving adequate support from its college and from the university at large in the context of budgetary constraints affecting higher education in general?
- Are library, computer and technology facilities, and other resources appropriate to support the program?

11. *Plans, Goals, and Resource Allocation*

- To what degree is the program central to the strategic priorities of the university and to the program's college priorities?
- How do the program's plans and goals serve to fulfill its mission?
- Is the program trying to do too much?
- What, if any, of the program's requests for additional resources does the review committee support, and why? How might the program's resources be redistributed to realize its goals and those of the university?
- Evaluation of resource requests and recommendations must be framed under three budget scenarios, i.e., a 20% reduced budget environment, constant budget environment, and a 20% increased budget environment.

12. *Other*

- Provide feedback and/or recommendations regarding other issues raised by the unit (per IX of the Unit Self-Study).

Travel and Expense Information for External Reviewers

External reviewers should make their own arrangements for transportation to Greenville. Most reviews are scheduled to begin on a Monday. If possible, external reviewers should arrive in Greenville on the day before the review begins in time for an organizational dinner with the other reviewers. Greenville is served by the Pitt Greenville Airport (PGV), which is about 10 minutes from the ECU campus. Alternative transportation venues include flying into Raleigh-Durham (RDU), renting a car and driving 90 miles to Greenville.

The Office of Academic Programs will make hotel arrangements for external reviewers.

External reviewers will be reimbursed for all related expenses and provided with an honorarium for their participation in the review process. The Division of Academic and Student Affairs, in conjunction with the Division for Research and Graduate Studies and/or Health Sciences and the Chancellor, will provide staffing and funds for expenses and honoraria of the *Review Committee*. Reviewer social security number and home address must be provided. These will be obtained while the reviewer is in Greenville. To be reimbursed for expenses, the reviewer must turn in all receipts to the Office of Academic Programs. Reviewers will be reimbursed for meals in accordance with UNC and State of North Carolina *per diem* regulations. For an airline ticket purchased on the Internet, the reviewer may submit an e-receipt in lieu of a paper receipt, but it needs to show evidence that the ticket has actually been paid for by a credit card, so that there is a zero balance on the charge for the ticket. Airline boarding passes also must be submitted.

REFERENCES

- ¹ **Graduate Program Review: Procedures for Graduate Program Review.** Division of Research and Graduate Studies. April 8, 2002. Graduate School. East Carolina University.
<http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/gradschool/review.cfm>
- ² **North Carolina State University Graduate Program Review Guidelines: A Guide for External Review**
<http://www.ncsu.edu/grad/faculty-and-staff/program-evaluation.html>
- ³ **Assessment and Review of Graduate Programs: A Policy Statement (2005).** Council of Graduate Schools. One DuPont Circle NW, Suite 230. Washington, DC 20036-1173
<http://www.cgsnet.org>
- ⁴ **Guide for the Review of Existing Academic Programs (2007).** Division of Academic Affairs. East Carolina University. Greenville, NC 27858. 14 pp.

APPENDICES

(Order and Content of Materials To Be Included with the Self-Study)

***Appendix A. Graduate Faculty/Student Committees Chaired
Over the Last 7 Years***

- Advisory Committees Chaired – Last seven Years
- Master's and Doctoral Student Committees:
Faculty Name and Rank, No. Completed, No. Current.

Appendix B. Student Placement

Show the first post-degree position placements of graduates for the past three years.

Type of position? In-State or Out-of-State?

Possible Areas of Employment to Consider:

1. Elementary and/or Secondary Schools
2. Two-Year Colleges
3. Four-Year Colleges and Universities
4. Government Agencies
5. Self-Employed Professionals
6. Business/Industry
7. Graduate and Post-Doctoral Programs
9. Other (Specify)

Appendix C. Degree Program/Degree Concentrations

Degree Program/Degree Concentration

-Please provide brief descriptions of each degree program, concentration, or area of emphasis.

-Enclose pamphlets or brochures that describe your programs and program concentrations.

Degree(s)

Classification of Instruction Programs (CIP) Code

Descriptive title

Annual number of students who elect this program

Number of FTEs in the unit who teach in the degree program(s)

Appendix D. Template for Faculty Sedona-Generated CV's for Self-Study

NAME

TITLE

UNIT OR PROGRAM

Room Number

East Carolina University

Greenville, NC 27858-_____

TELEPHONE #

FAX #

E-MAIL ADDRESS

EDUCATION/TRAINING (Beginning with baccalaureate degree, list institution, degree, dates of enrollment [e.g., 1984-87], and field of study)

POSITIONS and EMPLOYMENT (List in chronological order all previous positions, ending with current position. List honors, ending with most recent.)

OTHER RELEVANT EXPERIENCES and PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS (List in chronological order, ending with most recent.)

HONORS (List in chronological order, ending with most recent.)

PEER-REVIEW PUBLICATIONS (Present all publications –listed in chronological order, ending with most recent.)

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY SUPPORT (List ongoing and/or completed projects [federal and non-federal support])

COURSES TAUGHT (Last 7 Years) (Include course prefix, number, and title.)

Attach the Additional Information Below to the Faculty CV

RECENT GRADUATE STUDENT TRAINING EXPERIENCE [First, summarize students currently supervised, their degree levels, and general area of research, e.g., “Currently supervise one Ph.D. student (L. Young) and two M.S. students (J. Doe and B. Smith) in environmental toxicology research.” Second, list graduate students supervised over the past seven years, giving name, year of graduation, title of thesis or dissertation, and whether Ph.D. dissertation or Master’s thesis.]

Appendix E. Biennial Progress Report Format

Because the purpose of the external review is to improve a program, it is important that there be follow-up on the recommendations that were stated in that review. The purpose of the Biennial Progress Report is to provide a format for stating what has transpired in response to the review recommendations over the last two years. The report has two components: (1) a unit **action plan** implementation report; and (2) a unit **assessment plan** implementation report.

These two implementation plans will be archived and can be accessed through the Office of Academic Programs. Access will be provided to unit, college/school, division, and faculty senate officials.

Unit Action Plan Implementation

As a result of the *Review Committee's* recommendations for improvement, an action plan was developed by the unit program faculty in concert with discussions with college/school, division, and university administrators. The unit action plan is available from the Office of Academic Programs.

Every two years, each unit graduate program coordinator (UGPC) and Unit Undergraduate Program Coordinator (UUPC) will be asked to provide brief summaries on the "action item" responses to the *Review Committee's* recommendations. The summaries should address the following:

1. What progress has been made for improvement?
2. What if any items are behind schedule, and what are the hindrances to their timely completion?
3. What strategies have been developed to address these hindrances? Has the action item been modified? Have other resources been sought to fund the action item?
4. Is there need for input from the college/school and/or other levels of the administration for completion of the action items?
5. What process is in place for ongoing review of action items that will facilitate quality enhancement?

Unit Assessment Plan Implementation

In order to document the efforts of faculty to improve their unit programs, a biennial report of the assessment of undergraduate/graduate program outcomes and the actions taken in response to the key findings of those assessments. The report consists of brief responses to a set of questions with an emphasis on summarizing as opposed to providing details of assessment results. The questions are:

1. What outcomes were scheduled to be assessed during the present biennial reporting period? What outcomes were actually assessed? [Please refer to the unit program assessment plan].

2. What data were collected? Summarize findings for these data.
3. What did the unit program administration and the faculty learn about the program and/or the students from the analysis of the data? What areas of concern have emerged from the assessment?
4. As a result of the assessment, what changes, if any, have the unit program administration and the faculty implemented or considered implementing to address areas of concern? (These can include changes in the program and in the assessment plan.) How will the effectiveness of these changes be measured?
5. What outcomes are being planned for assessment for the upcoming biennial reporting period? (If they are different from what have been proposed in the assessment plan, please update the assessment plan to reflect the change).