Hood College Academic Program Review
(September 14, 2010)

Academic program reviews at Hood College are designed to improve the quality of the College’s academic offerings, to achieve the best use of available resources, and to foster cooperation among the academic units and administrative units. Reviews serve as a means to evaluate quality, productivity, need and demand within the College, state, and region; to determine effectiveness and consider possible modifications; and to facilitate academic planning and budgeting. They bring to each unit the advantages of assessment from the perspective of peers outside the institutions and colleagues from other units within the College.

Starting the Program Review Process:

- The Provost develops a time table for program reviews such that all programs are reviewed every 5 years. Programs that undergo external review by a disciplinary accrediting body may elect to submit the self-study developed for accreditation and the subsequent written evaluation in lieu of undergoing the Hood Academic Program Review.
- The Office of the Provost oversees the program review process.
- The Office of the Provost will notify the unit when the review will begin and the cycle of reviews will be listed in the Faculty Handbook.
- All undergraduate and graduate programs within the same unit will undergo program review during the same period.
- The Department Chair will appoint a faculty member to act as Program Review Coordinator for the review. If the graduate offerings are significant within the department, the Department Chair will collaborate with the Dean of the Graduate School in appointing the Program Review Coordinator and they may choose to appoint co-Program Review Coordinators to ensure a thorough understanding of both undergraduate and graduate programs.
- The Provost in collaboration with the Program Review Coordinator(s) will appoint an internal reviewer from among the faculty, but outside of the unit under evaluation. (optional)
- The Program Review Coordinator (s) will provide the Office of the Provost with no less than 3 names of potential external reviewers. Every attempt should be made to select reviewers from peer programs or peer institutions.

The role of the Program Review Co-coordinator:

The Program Review Coordinator participates in the choice of the internal/external reviewers and initiates the departmental self-study. She/he is responsible for compiling the self-study report to be submitted to the reviewers.

Program Self Study Content:

A. Program Characteristics
   1. Program mission, educational goals, intended student outcomes
   2. Relationship to the College mission, goals, and objectives
   3. Curriculum of the programs (including frequency of offerings)
4. A comparison of the programs under review and peer programs and/or national
trends/standards for like programs
5. Relationships with other programs at Hood (including how programs serve majors,
minors, and the core requirements) when appropriate
6. Unique features of the programs
7. Competitive advantages and disadvantages
8. Any significant changes in the program(s) during the last five years (changes in
mission, goals, curriculum, etc.)
9. Directions for the future
B. Assessment of Student Outcomes
A summary of the efforts of the programs/department during the previous five years to
assess the progress of students in the program and how the program has been improved as
a result of these assessment efforts.
C. Program quality
1. Status of accreditation, if appropriate
2. Nature and quality of faculty (full-time and part-time)
3. Nature and quality of students
4. Quality of the programs as reflected by student evaluations, student outcomes
   assessment, alumnae/i evaluations, senior surveys, graduate school preparation, job
   placement and student achievements
D. Program Support
1. Describe and delineate the institutional financial support and any external financial
   support received by programs
2. Describe the support personnel for your programs
3. Describe the lab facilities and equipment, if applicable
4. Describe the nature of your library resources and the computer/technology support
   that is available to your program(s)?
5. Describe your facilities and the maintenance of your space
E. Program Administration
Describe the nature of your program administration and any anticipated changes in your
administration structure.
F. Describe your self-assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the programs under
review.
G. Appendixes (include all of the following)
1. Catalog description of all programs
2. Representative syllabi for each course currently taught in the program
3. For the last five-years, course enrollment data, number of majors and minors, and
   breakdown of students by gender and race (obtain from Office of Institutional
   Research)
4. For the last five years, credit production, faculty load of fulltime faculty, average
   credits taken by students, and average load of adjunct faculty (OIR)
5. Description of the faculty over last five years (number of full and part-time, rank, area
   of specialization, etc.)
6. Survey results (Senior Survey and alumnae/i surveys) (OIR)
7. Department assessment plan
8. Annual report for the previous five years
9. Faculty vitae
10. Other data that the department deems necessary such as: J term offerings; contributions to the Honors Program; advisee load; Independent Studies/Internships/Practicum, etc.

**The Responsibilities of External Reviewers**

The external reviewers will:

1. read all self-study documents and note any questions or concerns to be addressed during the campus visit or subsequent conversations with representatives from campus;
2. schedule an on campus visit in collaboration with the unit under review;
3. meet with departmental faculty and students to discuss the self-study;
4. meet/communicate with the internal reviewer and take advantage of his/her insider knowledge of the workings of Hood;
5. meet with members of the College community such as representatives from the office of Institutional Research, the Dean of the Graduate School (where relevant), Academic Services, Career Services, The Registrar, Student Affairs personnel and others as necessary;
6. have an exit meeting with the Provost and the Program Review Coordinator to discuss preliminary thoughts at the end of the site visit; and
7. submit a report to the Provost and the Program Review Coordinator within 30 days of the campus visit.

**External Review Report will address:**

A. Program Characteristics
   1. Program mission, goals, and intended outcomes
   2. Relationship of the departmental/programmatic goals to the College mission and goals
   3. Curricular Structure
      a. Relationship to the program mission, goals, and intended outcomes
      b. Strengths and weaknesses with regard to student learning
   4. Currency of the program
      a. Comparison with similar programs at peer institutions
      b. Comparison with national standards/trends
   5. Relationship to other programs at Hood
      a. Dependence, independence
      b. Relationship with cognate programs
      c. Program duplication; possibilities for cooperative arrangements with other units
   6. Thoughts on future directions

B. Assessment of Student Outcomes
   1. Appropriateness of department assessment plans relative to the program goals and intended outcomes
   2. The extent to which intended outcomes are achieved
   3. Overall effect on student learning
C. Program Quality
   1. Status of accreditation, if appropriate
   2. Nature and quality of the faculty
   3. Nature and quality of the students
   4. Quality of the programs as reflected by student evaluations, alumnæ/i evaluations, student/alumnæ/i achievement, and assessment of student outcomes

D. Program support
   1. Institutional and external financial support
   2. Support personnel
   3. Laboratory facilities, equipment
   4. Library resources
   5. Computer resources
   6. Space and facility maintenance

E. Program Administration
   1. Organization, management, and direction
   2. Faculty contribution
   3. Student contribution

F. Overall recommendations
   1. Narrative of the strengths and challenges existing within the unit(s) under review
   2. Recommendations that would advance/improve the programs under review

Follow-Up Procedures

The effectiveness of academic program review is dependent upon follow-up procedures that are timely and meaningful. A copy of the report will be shared with the Dean of the Graduate School (by the Office of the Provost) when graduate programs have been a part of the programs under review. A summary of recommendations will be shared with the President, senior staff, and other units as appropriate. Follow-up meetings with members of the department under review will be scheduled by the Office of the Provost. The initial follow-up meeting will occur as soon as possible, but no later than 60 days following the start of the fall semester.

TIMETABLE

May 30 The Department will be officially notified that programs/units are scheduled for Program Review

February 1 The Self Study Document will be submitted to the Office of the Provost

March 15-April 15 On site review during this period

30 days post campus visit Report due from Review Team (Copy to Provost and Program Review Coordinator)